



AGENDA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

October 8, 2007

Arkansas Department of Education

State Education Building

9:00 AM

Chair's Report – Diane Tatum

Commissioner's Report – Dr. T. Kenneth James

 [Back](#)  [Print](#)

Reports

Report-1 Status Report on Arkansas Advanced Initiative for Math and Science (AAIMS) Grant

On August 29, 2007, Governor Mike Beebe announced at a news conference that Arkansas is one of only seven states to receive a \$13.2 million grant from the National Math and Science Initiative to improve the Advanced Placement scores of students. Exxon Mobil Corporation has invested \$125 million to support this national initiative. The goal of the program is to increase the number of students scoring 3 or higher on Advanced Placement (AP) exams in math, science and English. The grant will be administered by a new non-profit foundation, Arkansas Advanced Initiative for Math and Science, Inc. (AAIMS). Ms. Tommie Sue Anthony is the President of the foundation. The University of Arkansas at Little Rock is the supporting partner. The Arkansas Department of Education and the Governor's office were closely involved with the grant proposal and fully support the grant.

Presenter: Tommie Sue Anthony

Report-2 Status Report and Evaluation Update for Arkansas Better Chance Program (ABC)

This is a report that was requested by the Board.

Presenter: Paul Lazenby

Consent Agenda

C-1 Minutes - September 10, 2007 Minutes - September 24, 2007

Presenter: Diane Tatum, Chairman

C-2 Newly Hired, Promotions and Separations

The applicant data from this information is used to compile the Applicant Flow Chart forms for the Affirmative Action Report, which demonstrates the composition of applicants through the selecting, hiring, promoting and terminating process.

Presenter: Beverly Williams Clemetta Hood

C-3 Commitment to Principles of Desegregation Settlement Agreement: Report on the

Execution of the Implementation Plan

*By the Court Order of December 1, 1993, the Department of Education is required to file a monthly Project Management Tool (PMT) to the court and the parties to assure its commitment to the Desegregation Plan. This report describes the progress the ADE has made since March 15, 1994, in complying with the provisions of the Implementation Plan (Plan) and itemizes the ADE's progress against the timelines presented in the Plan. Process * In October, the report emphasizes the following: 1. Summary of the PMT for September.*

Presenter: Dr. Charity Smith/Willie Morris

C-4 Reports on Waivers to School Districts for Teachers Teaching Out-of-Area for Longer than Thirty (30) Consecutive Days, Act 1623 of 2001

Act 1623 of 2001 requires local school districts to secure a waiver when classrooms are staffed with unlicensed teachers for longer than 30 days. Waiver requests were received from 47 school districts covering a total of 95 positions. None of these requests were from a district in academic distress. These requests have been reviewed, either approved or denied by Department staff and are consistent with program guidelines.

Presenter: Beverly Williams

C-5 Review of Loan and Bond Applications

Pursuant to Arkansas Code Annotated 6-20-805 and 6-20-1205, the State Board of Education must approve all Revolving Loan Fund and Commercial Bond applications, with the exception of non-voted refundings of commercial bond issues that meet the minimum savings as required by the Rules and Regulations Governing Loan and Bond Applications, Section 9.02. It is recommended that the State Board of Education review the following. Revolving Loans: 1 Bus Application and 1 Construction Application- Recommend Approval; Commercial Bonds - 4 Second Lien Applications-Recommend Approval; 3 Voted Bond Applications- Recommend Approval

Presenter: Dr. Bobbie Davis and Ms. Amy Woody

C-6 Report on Five-Year Evaluation of Regional Service Cooperatives

Every five years, the regional service cooperatives must undergo a self-study and evaluation. That process was conducted during the spring of 2007 and the resulting summary report is provided for informational purposes.

Presenter: Dr. Charles D. Watson

C-7 Consideration of Waiver of Mandatory Attendance Days - Little Rock Central High School

Pursuant to activities related to the celebration of 50th Central High School Anniversary, the Little Rock School requests that the State Board of Education grant a waiver for two (2) days of the required number of instructional day specifically September 24 and 25, 2007. The Little Rock School District and Central High Principal suggest that events and security surrounding the celebration necessitate not having students in classes during these two days. Many students will be participating in activities of the celebration. The waiver would allow students enrolled at Central High School not be required to make up the two days at the close of the school year.

Presenter: Dr. Ken James

C-8 Consideration of Work Force Data Report

The Department of Education and its education affiliates Work Force Data Report was distributed at the September 10, 2007, State Board meeting. The Human Resources Office requests Board action to receive the report. Thus the report is submitted as part of the Consent Agenda.

Presenter: Beverly Williams/Clemetta Hood

Action Agenda

A-1 Request for Approval of 2007-2008 Arkansas Better Chance Grants - Round #4

Pursuant to the Rules and Regulations Governing the Arkansas Better Chance Program, DHS DCC/ECE requests approval of the attached grants for funding through the 2007-2008 Arkansas Better Chance Program.

Presenter: Paul Lazenby

A-2 Consideration for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing the Guidelines, Procedures and Enforcement of the Arkansas Public School Choice Act

On July 9, 2007 the State Board approved for public comment Proposed Rules Governing the Guidelines, Procedures and Enforcement of the Arkansas Public School Choice Act. On August 16, 2007, a public hearing was held at the Department. Two people attended the public hearing but neither wished to provide either oral or written comments concerning the Rules. No comments concerning the Rules have been received by the Department. The Department is requesting final approval from the State Board on the Rules Governing the Guidelines, Procedures and Enforcement of the Arkansas Public School Choice Act.

Presenter: Scott Smith/Tripp Walter

A-3 Request for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing The Reimbursement By School Districts for Election Expenses

Act 1200 was enacted by the General Assembly during the 2007 session to clarify that school districts were required to reimburse counties for the entire cost of school elections. A public hearing was held on September 7, 2007, at the Department of Education auditorium. No recommendations for changes were received during the public comment period.

The Arkansas Department of Education recommends that the State Board of Education approve the proposed Rules Governing the Reimbursement by School Districts for Election Expenses.

Presenter: Dr. Bobbie Davis

A-4 Request for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing The Quality, Security, Validation, and Timeliness of Public School Data In The Arkansas Public School Computer Network

Act 723 was enacted by the General Assembly during the 2007 session to improve the quality, security, and timeliness of public school data in the APSCN network. A public hearing was held on September 7, 2007, at the Department of Education auditorium. No one attended the meeting to comment on the proposed rules. The Arkansas Department of Education recommends that the State Board of Education approve the proposed Rules Governing The Quality, Security, Validation, and Timeliness of Public School Data In The Arkansas Public School Computer Network.

Presenter: Dr. Bobbie Davis

A-5 Consideration for Final Approval: Rules Governing the Requirements and Procedures for Renewing a Standard Arkansas Teaching License

On July 9, 2007, the State Board approved for public comment the Proposed Rules Governing the Requirements and Procedures for Renewing a Standard Teaching License. On August 16, 2007, a public hearing was held at the Department. There were no public comments concerning this rule.

The Department of Education is requesting final approval from the State Board on the revised Rules Governing Requirements and Procedures for Renewing a Standard Teaching License.

Presenter: Beverly Williams

A-6 Consideration for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing Arkansas Alternative Pay Programs.

On August 13, 2007, the State Board approved for public comment the Proposed Rules Governing the Arkansas Alternative Pay Programs pursuant to Act 847 of 2007. On September 11, 2007, a public hearing was held at the Department. Comments were presented at the public hearing and received by regular and electronic mail.

The Department of Education is requesting final approval from the State Board on the Rules Governing Arkansas Alternative Pay Programs.

Presenter: Beverly Williams

A-7 Consideration for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program

On August 13, 2007, the State Board approved for public comment the Proposed Rules Governing the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program pursuant to Act 1029 of 2007. On September 11, 2007, a public hearing was held at the Department. Comments were presented at the public hearing and were received by regular mail.

The Department of Education is requesting final approval of the Proposed Rules Governing the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program.

Presenter: Beverly Williams

A-8 Consideration for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing Incentives for Teacher Recruitment and Retention in High Priority Districts with an Average Daily Membership of 1,000 or Fewer.

On August 13, 2007, the State Board approved for public comment the Proposed Rules Governing Incentives for Teacher Recruitment and Retention in High Priority Districts with an Average Daily Membership of 1,000 or Fewer pursuant to Act 1044 of 2007. On September 11, 2007, a public hearing was held at the Department. There were no comments concerning this rule.

The Department of Education is requesting final approval of the Proposed Rules Governing Incentives for Teacher Recruitment and Retention in High Priority Districts with an Average Daily Membership of 1,000 or Fewer.

Presenter: Beverly Williams

A-9 Request for Denial of Waiver Request for Certified Employee: Michael Allen Rains

Mr. Rains was convicted of Felony Possession of a Controlled Substance with Intent to Deliver (a violation of the Uniform Controlled Substances Act) in 2001. This is a disqualifying offense for employment with a school district as a certified employee pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. 6-17-410(c)(13). Mr. Rains was notified of his ineligibility on July 23, 2007. A request for a waiver was submitted on August 16, 2007, pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. 6-17-410(d). Mr. Rains has no other disqualifying convictions. Based on the afore-mentioned circumstances, the Arkansas Department of Education recommends that a license not be granted to Mr. Michael Allen Rains.

Presenter: Scott Smith/Tripp Walter

Minutes
State Department of Education
Monday, September 10, 2007

The State Department of Education met on Monday, September 10, 2007, in the Auditorium of the State Education Building. Diane Tatum, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

The following Board members were present: Diane Tatum, Chair; Randy Lawson, Vice-Chair; Sherry Burrow; Jim Cooper; Brenda Gullett; Dr. Tim Knight; Dr. Ben Mays; MaryJane Rebick; and Dr. Naccaman Williams. Non-voting member Justin Minkel also attended.

No Board members were absent.

Chair's Report

Ms. Tatum welcomed new Board member Brenda Gullett and Justin Minkel, 2007 Arkansas Teacher of the Year, who will serve as a non-voting member of the Board for the coming school year.

Ms. Tatum reported visits to the Pine Bluff School District and the Harmony Grove School District. She noted that the pre-school meeting for Harmony Grove Teachers included a session for community and business partners at which Dr. Charity Smith was the guest speaker.

Ms. Burrow reported a visit to the Arkansas Leadership Academy Partners meeting. She noted that teachers and principals who have been participants in the Academy training program were most complimentary of the training received during the institute and they commented on the impact of the Academy in improving instruction and leadership in local districts.

Mr. Lawson reported on the back to school sessions at the Bentonville District. He stated that Governor Beebe attended the opening session, which included more than 1200 educators from the Bentonville District.

Ms. Rebick reported attendance at a statewide conference addressing science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), which convened at the Statehouse Convention Center. She noted the conference included an array of national and state speakers, including Governor Beebe.

Commissioner's Report

Dr. James welcomed Ms. Gullett and Mr. Minkel to Board membership. Additionally he reported on the following:

- BMI reports for the 2006-2007 school year will be released this week jointly between the Department of Education and the Department of Health. He

noted the report will show approximately 30% of students are either classified as overweight or at risk of being overweight.

- The state received a national grant to expand Advanced Placement programs specifically in mathematics and science. The grant recipient will be the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. Arkansas was one of seven states to receive this award.
- This year is the Department of Education's turn to host the joint session of the state boards of education. He suggested planning toward the joint session being held in December.
- Attendance at an alternate learning academy meeting held on the University of Central Arkansas campus. He noted approximately 100 participants working to improve learning for these students.

Dr. James presented the Milken Award trophy to Justin Minkel and commented that Mr. Minkel was recognized as a finalist for National Teacher of the Year.

Dr. James introduced Dr. Alice Barnes Rose from Forrest City who is joining the Department on October 1 as Assistant Commissioner for Learning Services.

Reports

Dr. Charity Smith was recognized to present a report describing up-coming activities related to the Little Rock Central High 50-Year Commemoration.

Dr. James summarized the fiscal distress status of Bald Knob School District and highlighted events of the past two weeks. Dr. James stated that a special Board meeting has been called for Monday, September 24, 2007, to convene at 9:00 a.m. at the Department of Education Building. Dr. James noted that conditions within the Bald Knob School District require the Department to assume immediate management of the District with removal of the superintendent and local school board. Dr. James reported that James Staggs has been retained to serve as interim superintendent until further Board action can be taken.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Lawson moved approval of the Consent Agenda as presented. Ms. Burrow seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

- Minutes – August 13, 2007
- Commitment to Principles of Desegregation Settlement Agreement: Report on the Execution of the Implementation Plan
- Newly Employed, Promotions and Separations
- Reports on Waivers to School Districts for Teachers Teaching Out-of-Area for Longer than Thirty (30) Consecutive Days, Act 1623 of 2001
- 2006-2007 Arkansas Home School Annual Report
- Request for Approval of Stipulated Agreement of Waiver Request for Certified Employment – Andrew E. Cates

- Request for Approval of Stipulated Agreement – Joe Gray
- Request for Approval of Stipulated Agreement – Dan B. Mourtisen
- Consideration of the State Adoption List and Authorization for Contracts for Social Studies K-8 and 9-12, Arkansas History, and Drivers Education Textbooks

Action Agenda

Report on the Progress Concerning the Resolution of the Balance Owed to Arkansas Teacher Retirement System (ATRS) by HAAS Hall Academy, Farmington

Dr. Mary Ann Brown was recognized to present this report. Dr. Brown stated that HAAS Hall staff and ATRS staff have worked together and report agreement on all issues except one: that issue simply awaits data that is to be submitted within this week. Ms. Rebick noted that the parties have had one month to complete these issues, why does the Board not have a final resolution? Dr. Brown stated information from ATRS is that the parties have worked diligently and cooperatively to complete the process, which has taken more time to collect data than expected. Ms. Tatum asked for assurance that the final documents will be in place within the week. Parties responded affirmatively. Dr. Mays suggested that a final report should be forthcoming by the time of the special meeting on September 24. Ms. Tatum directed the parties to complete all issues with a report on September 24. Ms. Rebick asked about resolution of payments that may be due as a result of the data. Dr. Brown stated that payment had not been discussed. Ms. Rebick affirmed that payment should be forthcoming by September 24.

Dr. Mays moved to receive the report. Dr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Request for Approval of 2007-2008 Arkansas Better Chance Grants – Round #3

Paul Lazenby was recognized to present this item. Mr. Lazenby stated that additional proposals have been received, subjected to the internal review process, and are recommended for approval and funding. Dr. Williams asked about two previously funded proposals that were recommended for decreased awards. Mr. Lazenby noted that those proposals advertised for students, but enrollments were less than anticipated, thus the amount of funds allocated should be decreased.

Dr. Williams moved approval as presented. Mr. Lawson seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration of Recommendations of Performance Levels for the Alternate Portfolio Assessment for Students with Disabilities for Science Portfolio (Grades 5 and 7) and for the Performance Level Descriptors for Special Education Alternate Portfolio Assessment for English Language Arts (Grades 3-8 and Grade 11), Mathematics (Grades 3-9) and for Science (Grades 5, 7, and 10)

Dr. Gayle Potter was recognized to present this item. Dr. Potter reported that special committees of practitioners reviewed these recommendations and they are in keeping with requirements of No Child Left Behind Legislation and the assessment system.

Ms. Gullett asked for a definition of portfolio. Dr. Potter responded that the portfolio assessment was an alternate method of determining student performance based on the content standards, but directed to students that have severe and/or profound handicapping conditions. Ms. Burrow asked if there was still a limited number of students that could participate in this type of assessment. Dr. Potter responded that the number of students participating was not limited, but at the present time, the number of students who can be counted as proficient on the alternate assessment is limited to 1% of the student population.

Mr. Cooper asked if there were public groups that will want to approach the board about lack of participation in setting of these standards. Dr. Potter indicated that the recommendations have been posted on the Web Site with the agenda and that she has received no contact about these recommendations. Ms. Gullett asked for additional information and will contact Dr. Potter or Charlotte Marvel at a later time. Mr. Lawson asked if there were a way to make these reports more brief. He observed that the documentation is contained in 114 pages, which is often very technical. Dr. Potter and Dr. James responded that such documentation is required by federal legislation, especially where handicapped students are involved.

Ms. Burrow moved approval as presented. Ms. Rebick seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Public Comment: Proposed Rules Governing the Use of Net Gate Receipts by Public School Districts

Dr. Bobbie Davis was recognized to present this item. Dr. Davis noted this rule is relatively short and is specifically linked to new legislation. Dr. Williams asked if the concept of net gate receipts was clearly defined and understood by schools across the state. Dr. Davis responded that with the wording in the rule, there should be a better understanding of the definitions. Dr. Mays commented that net gate receipts will not be administered consistently as long as schools/districts are allowed to determine what is subtracted before the revenue becomes "net." Dr. Davis responded that the statute provides considerable discretion in letting local districts decide what is removed.

Dr. Williams moved approval for public comment. Dr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing the Arkansas Financial Accounting and Reporting System and Annual Training Requirements

Dr. Bobbie Davis was recognized to present this item. Dr. Davis reported that a public hearing was conducted and minor changes were made. An updated version was distributed. Ms. Rebick moved final approval as revised. Dr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing the Athletic Expenditures for Public School Districts

Dr. Bobbie Davis was recognized to present this item. Dr. Davis reported that a public hearing was conducted and changes have been made in response to comments from the public hearing and written comments that were received. Dr. Davis reviewed recommended changes as compared to the document approved for public comment. Mr. Lawson asked about interpretation of Section 7.01 and depositing funds in the Activity Fund. He asked about funds raised by booster clubs to help support athletic teams. Dr. Davis responded that if those funds are managed through the school fiscal accounting system, they are to be deposited through activity funds; however, if the booster club manages its own funds and those funds are used to purchase equipment or otherwise enhance the athletics program, then those funds are not accounted for in the activity fund.

Ms. Burrow asked for clarification on funds that would be expected to go into the activity fund. Dr. Davis responded any money raised by school groups administered through the school. Mr. Cooper suggested that some additional clarification might be needed to more precisely define private funds. Dr. Mays noted that the legislation appears vague in defining such funds. Scott Smith suggested that the Rule cannot require private associations (booster clubs) to deposit their funds to a public institution like a school district.

Ms. Gullett asked about the process for removing a school from fiscal distress should it get classified as such as a result of activity funds. Dr. Davis suggested there would be no difference in treating a school classified in fiscal distress regardless of the condition that got them there.

State Representative Betty Pickett was recognized to speak to this rule. Ms. Pickett noted the difficulty of determining and reporting athletics expenditures and observed that some districts do not make such reports. Ms. Pickett asked for consideration of a better way to establish utilities expenditures and maintenance expenditures: hopefully reporting of these expenditures can be clarified for all districts. She commented about the procedure for calculating transportation costs: she stated this should be a simple calculation multiplying cost per mile times the mileage traveled. Additionally, Ms. Pickett asked for a uniform way to determine the number of full time equivalent (FTE) from which to determine coaching salaries.

Dr. Mays responded to comments by Ms. Pickett and noted that athletics expenditures are not included in the school funding formula, which was designed to provide adequacy. He noted that some superintendents take money from the adequacy funding and give it to the sports program. He affirmed that sports programs are not part of a school's adequacy responsibility. Dr. Mays suggested that audits of school funding should review discrepancies across district, consider transportation costs by using a transportation multiplier with miles traveled, determine a "headcount" on coaches, and audit funds spent on maintenance and utilities costs prorated to athletics programs. Dr. Davis noted that state auditors are required to audit athletics programs

and she suggested that it will take some time to get this process "up to speed," and the Board should give that audit process time to work and give the Legislative Audit Division time to make a study. Dr. Davis suggested that reporting could take care of Ms. Pickett's concern with transportation and it would be possible to get the FTE from current reporting.

Ms. Gullett asked if other extracurricular activities would be held to the same scrutiny as athletics. Dr. Davis responded that it was the ultimate intent, but not prescribed in the current legislation.

Dr. Mays again asked about transportation costs and making all districts subject to the same formula. He noted that such a requirement for computing and reporting transportation expenditures would be a step toward consistent data across all districts in the state. Dr. Davis noted that some districts have their own formula for determining transportation costs and prefer their structure.

Mr. Cooper suggested that the Board give schools a year to work with the Rule and for Legislative Audit to make recommendations. Mr. Cooper asked for an interpretation of time an athletic coach spends teaching physical education. Dr. Davis responded that physical education is not considered part of the athletics program and physical education teachers are not counted toward FTE for coaching. Mr. Cooper also asked about the legality of requiring local school boards to make or validate reports as contained in Section 6.0. Dr. Davis responded that legally local boards should have such authority.

Dr. Williams stated that he "appreciates" the need for transparency with computing and reporting athletics expenditures. He asked if the rule is amended to include some of the comments being considered if an additional comment period should be considered. Scott Smith opined that most of the comments under consideration were made during the comment period, some were just not written in proposed revisions; thus, further comment is not necessary.

Dr. Davis reviewed the suggested amendments:

- 3.03 clarify definition of private donation expenditure
- 4.06 revert back to original approved in version for public comment
- 6.01 include both local school district and local school board as being responsible
- 7.01 add private donations made directly to district required to be reported in activity fund

Mr. Lawson moved final adoption with the above amendments. Ms. Burrow seconded the motion.

Dr. Mays moved to amend the motion to include the following:

- Compute transportation costs by computing actual mileage traveled times common multiplier unless a district establishes a formula that will support greater expenses

- Add the computation of Full-Time-Equivalent (FTE) for coaches to reporting requirement.

Dr. Williams seconded the amendment. The amendment was adopted on a roll-call vote 7 yes, 1 no (Gullett voted no).

The amended motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing the Funding of Public Schools

Dr. Bobbie Davis was recognized to present this item. Dr. Davis stated that comments were received and considered in presenting the rule for final approval. Ms. Rebick moved final approval as submitted. Dr. Mays seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing the Calculation of Miscellaneous Funds

Dr. Bobbie Davis was recognized to present this item. Dr. Davis stated that no comments were received during the public comment period.

Dr. Williams moved final approval. Ms. Rebick seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Rules Governing Waivers of the Earnings Limitations under the Teacher Retirement System

Beverly Williams was recognized to present this item. Ms. Williams stated that a letter was sent to school districts from the Arkansas Teacher Retirement System (ATRS) describing the condition that must be met – less than 30 years of unfunded teacher liability – before the rule as written could be implemented. Ms. Rebick noted that the Board will pass a rule which cannot be implemented. Dr. James commented that the Department and the Board must continue to work to get this option available to the Department in order for the Department to take advantage of the talent and valuable resource pool in recently retired individuals. Mr. Lawson asked how the Board could be of help in implementation of the Rule. Dr. James suggested that additional legislation will be required.

Ms. Rebick moved final adoption. Mr. Cooper seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Rules Governing the Distribution of Student Special Needs Funding and the Determination of Allowable Expenditures of those Funds

Dr. Bobbie Davis was recognized to present this item. Dr. Davis reviewed proposed revisions being suggested as a result of comments made during public review. Ms. Burrow asked about the consideration required under Provision 2. Dr. Davis noted that

Provision 2 is a special category in the free and reduced lunch program. A district establishes a base one year then for the next four years that district does not take additional applications for free and reduced lunch program. She stated that under the NSLA rule the free and reduced lunch number is the basis for funding.

Ms. Rebick stated reservations about flexibility of local districts for use of funds, especially when the district is classified in fiscal distress. Dr. Davis stated that the rule provides some flexibility, even when a district is classified in fiscal distress. Ms. Rebick stated her disagreement with that flexibility in the rule.

Former state representative Jody Mahoney stated that the Bureau of Legislative Research formed a section within that office to review rules and provide comment and as a result the legislative process should be more cognizant of these rules before they are presented for legislative review. Mr. Mahoney stated that there is a disagreement within the Bureau regarding transitional funding as defined in the rule. He noted that the legislative staff and Department will need to work together before the next session to determine if further revisions are needed with the NSLA funding.

Dr. Mays asked for clarification within the rule for hiring additional teachers to reduce ratios, but would not allow for increase in the overall salary schedule for teachers.

Ms. Gullett stated that there is a danger that programs funded under the rule may pay salaries of teachers over improving instruction in high-needs schools.

Mr. Cooper moved approval as proposed. Dr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion was adopted on a voice vote 7 yes and 1 no (Rebick voted no).

Consideration for Final Approval: Proposed Rules Governing the Final Close of Public School Financial Records

Dr. Bobbie Davis was recognized to present this item. Dr. Davis stated that no comments were received regarding this rule; thus, no changes are proposed.

Mr. Cooper moved final approval. Dr. Mays seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Rules Governing Eligibility and Financial Incentives for Arkansas Leadership Academy Master Principal Designation

Beverly Williams was recognized to present this item. Ms. Tatum asked what happened to additional funding for principals who were recognized with master principal designation after the initial five years of additional salary. Ms. Williams responded that no additional funding is available – five years is the end of the bonus.

Ms. Gullett moved final approval. Ms. Burrow seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Rules Governing Waivers for Substitute Teachers

Beverly Williams was recognized to present this item. Ms. Williams reported that comments were received, but no revisions are recommended. Ms. Rebick asked about substitute teachers who fill in for a period greater than 32 consecutive days. Ms. Williams responded that legislation was needed to clarify the conditions where some districts were moving individuals in and out periodically to avoid the number of days. This legislation and the rule close the loop hole some districts were using.

Mr. Lawson moved final approval. Dr. Knight seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Rules Governing the Lifetime Teaching License

Beverly Williams was recognized to present this item. Ms. Williams reported that no comments were received and no one attended the public hearing. Dr. Mays asked if there was no experience requirement. Ms. Williams responded that an eligible teacher must meet current licensure requirements. Ms. Gullett noted that most teachers would like to be eligible for lifetime license upon retirement, not at age 65. Ms. Williams noted that age 65 is a requirement of the law.

Dr. Knight moved final approval. Ms. Burrow seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Rules Governing Parental Notification of an Assignment of a Non-Licensed Teacher to Teach a Class for More than Thirty (30) Consecutive Days and for Granting Waivers.

Beverly Williams was recognized to present this item. Ms. Williams reported that no comments were received and no one attended the public hearing. Mr. Lawson asked about consistency of wording in designating the responsible party – district, board, superintendent. Dr. James stated that the local superintendent must sign a statement of assurances and there is a penalty – removal of license – for not reporting accurate and timely information. Mr. Lawson suggested: “Amend Section 5.02 (F) to read, “The superintendent of any school district that obtains a waiver shall send written notice of the assignment of a non-certified licensed teacher to the parent or guardian of each student in that classroom no later than thirty (30) school days after the date of the assignment.” This revision places emphasis on the responsibility of the superintendent to carry out the requirement of this section.”

Mr. Cooper moved final approval with recommended change as stated. Mr. Lawson seconded the motion. The motion was adopted on voice vote of 7 yes, 1 no (Rebick voted no).

Consideration for Final Approval: Rules Governing Eligibility of Participating School Districts in the Traveling Teacher Program

Beverly Williams was recognized to present this item. Ms. Williams stated that comments were received, but no revisions to the previously proposed rule are suggested.

Mr. Lawson moved final approval. Mr. Cooper seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration for Final Approval: Arkansas Department of Education Rules and Regulations Governing Home Schools

Dee Cox was recognized to present this item. Ms. Cox reported those attending the public hearing were supportive of the rule and suggested no comments.

Dr. Knight moved final approval. Mr. Cooper seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration of State Board of Education Travel Guideline

Dr. Williams was recognized to present this item. Dr. Williams stated that a committee was formed to review guidelines pertaining to travel associated with the Board's membership in the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE). Mr. Lawson asked if similar guidelines might apply to Board travel pertaining to other panels or organizations. Dr. Williams noted that most of the organizations such as SREB that invite Board member participation generally pay for travel. Ms. Rebick stated that travel to attend meetings for conferences that does not require reimbursement should not need review and approval. Mr. Cooper stated it was his understanding that the proposed guidelines address travel to NASBE and they should be adopted as presented.

Mr. Cooper moved approval as presented. Dr. Mays seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Consideration of Representation at the NASBE Annual Meeting

Ms. Tatum reported that MaryJane Rebick indicated interest in attending the NASBE annual conference in Philadelphia on October 11-13. No other Board members expressed the intent to attend.

Report

Richard Schoe was recognized to address the Board. Mr. Schoe commented on: 1) Request "Bully" policy be amended and made all-inclusive, covering adult-adult, adult-child; child-adult and child-child relationships. 2) Request that when Child and Family Services lists a teacher on the Central Registry that there be a process to recognize this action and guidelines to evaluate the potential impact on the students in the classroom. Suggest Day Care Licensing Guidelines as a model.

Mr. Mays suggested that the Board have a future discussion regarding athletic spending rules once additional information is received from the legislative audit

procedure regarding maintenance and utility expenditures. He suggested such a discussion be scheduled at least annually as an agenda item to match school records with what audits show. Dr. Williams concurred at least for next year.

Mr. Lawson moved adjournment. Mr. Cooper seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

The Minutes were recorded and reported by Dr. Charles D. Watson.

Minutes
State Board of Education
Monday, September 24, 2007

The State Board of Education met for a specially called session by Commissioner of Education, Dr. Ken James and Chairman, Diane Tatum on Monday, September 24, 2007, in the Auditorium of the State Education Building. Diane Tatum, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Board members present: Diane Tatum, Chair; Randy Lawson, Vice-Chair; Sherry Burrow; Jim Cooper; Brenda Gullett; Dr. Tim Knight; Dr. Ben Mays; MaryJane Rebick; and Dr. Naccaman Williams.

No Board members were absent.

Report

Update on HAAS Hall Charter School Payments to Arkansas Teacher Retirement System

Mary Ann Brown was recognized to present this report. Dr. Brown introduced Mindy Looney representing the Arkansas Teacher Retirement System (ATRS) who affirmed that full agreement has been reached between the ATRS and HAAS Hall Academy and that a payment of the total amount of restitution funds was received. She confirmed that HAAS Hall Academy has no additional outstanding obligations to ATRS.

Ms. Rebick inquired as to the source of funds used to make the payment. Dr. Martin Shoppmeyer responded that the payment was made using carry-over funds from last school year and new award funds from the current operating budget.

Mr. Lawson moved to accept the report as presented. Dr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Action Agenda

Consideration of Request for Proposed Annexation of Bald Knob School District to Another Appropriate School District – Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1404 et. seq. and Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-20-1901 et. seq.

(A complete transcript of the proceedings of this item were recorded and reported by a court reporter. That transcript can be accessed through the State Board of Education Office in the Department of Education.)

Dr. Ken James opened the discussion of this item with a PowerPoint presentation detailing the financial status of the Bald Knob School District. Dr. James noted that the data presented were also presented to a community meeting in Bald Knob prior to the State assuming fiscal administration of the district.

Scott Smith reviewed the steps taken by the Department of Education in filing the petition for annexation of the district to another district due to the financial status of the Bald Knob School District. He stated that all preceding actions were complete that would allow the Board to take action based on the petition. Mr. Smith also outlined the process that the hearing would follow. Mr. James Staggs, former superintendent of the Bald Knob District (retired), was introduced as the interim superintendent. Scott Smith referenced a letter from the Attorney General, which recapped any potential negative impact that the proposed action might have on pending desegregation within the Bald Knob District or any other district that might be involved in an annexation.

Dr. Bobbie Davis reviewed the financial status of the Bald Knob District and the districts that are contiguous to the Bald Knob District. Dr. Diana Julian reviewed the school improvement status as defined by No Child Left Behind and Frank Wimer presented the accreditation status of each of the districts.

James Staggs was recognized to report progress of the district since August 22, 2007. At the conclusion of Mr. Staggs' comments he recognized Mr. Larry Kirchner, president and CEO of Citizens State Bank of Bald Knob who affirmed that citizens of the Bald Knob District had raised in excess of \$1.5 million, which is on deposit in Citizens State Bank. Mr. Staggs concluded his presentation with a listing of proposed cuts, reductions and other cost saving measures that are being implemented and will be carried out over the next two years. He stated that his projection is for a possible surplus of \$400,000 at the end of the current fiscal year. He appealed for the Board to allow the Bald Knob District to work through these financial issues and to continue to exist as an independent school district.

Superintendents from each of the five contiguous districts, Augusta, Bradford, Midland, Riverview and White County Central spoke and cited cautions about annexing the larger Bald Knob District with a smaller district.

Questions and discussion focused on further affirmation that the district is now headed in a positive direction financially and that it is possible to end the fiscal year with an operating balance. Dr. Davis responded that there are no

guarantees, but Department staff members work almost daily with Mr. Staggs on budget issues and pursue strategies for implementing the outlined cost-saving strategies.

Mr. Lawson moved to allow the Bald Knob District to remain independent under state supervision. Mr. Cooper seconded the motion.

Dr. Williams asked to consider an amendment to the motion that provides additional timelines and conditions. Other Board members raised issues related to staffing in the administrative area, passage of the proposed sales tax, audit of school books by Legislative Audit, and other options to total district annexation such as dividing up the district and annexing to multiple districts.

Dr. James provided the following summarizing statements:

- Commended the community for raising over \$1.5 million
- Mr. Staggs is working most cooperatively with Department staff in implementing cost-saving measures including staff reductions
- Community proposed a \$0.02 sales tax devoted to school debt repayment which has a potential revenue income of \$176,000 this year
- Potential for budget to have up to \$400,000 excess by end of the current fiscal year if all options come together as planned.

Dr. James proposed, that given the current status of potential revenue and cost-saving measures presented, to allow the district to retain its classification in fiscal distress and continue to operate until after the sales tax election in November; then, place an item on the December Board agenda that would report on the tax proposal, provide an update on cost-saving implementation, and report on budget projections at that time. He suggested that the Board could consider additional action in December.

Mr. Lawson and Mr. Cooper agreed to the conditions outlined by Dr. James. The motion was adopted unanimously on a roll call vote.

Dr. Mays asked for the Bald Knob District to provide a break down on facilities cost for instructional space as compared to space for athletics events in the new facility.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

These minutes were recorded and reported by Dr. Charles D. Watson

NEWLY EMPLOYED FOR THE PERIOD OF September 1, 2007 – September 30, 2007

Alainna Blubaugh- Public School Program Advisor, Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN), Grade 21, effective 09/10/07.

Roy Causbie- Public School Program Advisor, Division of Learning Services, Standard Assurance, Grade 21, effective 09/04/07.

Steven Ross- Applications and Systems Analyst, Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN), Grade 21, effective 09/10/07.

*Linda Williams- Agency Director Research & Statistics, Division of Research & Technology, Grade 20, effective 09/04/07.

PROMOTIONS/ LATERAL TRANSFERS FOR THE PERIOD OF September 1, 2007 – September 30, 2007

*Rickey Jackson- from Administrative Assistant II, Academic Accountability, Desegregation, Grade 17, to Ed Supervisor Special Services, Division of Learning Services, School Improvement, Grade 20, effective 09/10/07.

*Hope Moore- from a Secretary II, Division of Learning Services, Curriculum, Assessment & Research, Grade 13, to an Administrative Assistant I, Division of Learning Services, Curriculum, Assessment & Research, Grade 15, effective 09/10/07.

SEPARATIONS FOR THE PERIOD OF September 1, 2007 – September 30, 2007

Aliza Jones- Area Project Manager, DPSAF and Transportation, Grade 23, effective 09/28/07. 2 years, 3 months, 11 days. Code: 01

*Selina Mahon- Secretary II, Division of Learning Services, Curriculum, Assessment & Research, Grade 13, effective 09/20/07. 0 years, 9 months, 16 days. Code: 07

John McKinnon- Public School Administrative Advisor, Division of Learning Services, Standards Assurance, Grade 21, effective 09/28/07. 17 years, 3 months, 7 days. Code Retirement

*Minority

AASIS Code:

Voluntary- 01

Career Advancement- 07

**ADE'S PROJECT MANAGEMENT TOOL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
SEPTEMBER 30, 2007**

This document summarizes the progress that ADE has made in complying with the provisions of the Implementation Plan during the month of September 2007.

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE ACTIVITY	PMT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2007
<i>I. Financial Obligation</i>	<p>As of August 31, 2007, State Foundation Funding payments paid for FY 07/08 totaled \$6,032,957 to LRSD, \$3,243,834 to NLRSD, and \$4,947,758 to PCSSD. The Magnet Operational Charge paid as of August 31, 2007, was \$1,394,497. The allotment for FY 07/08 was \$15,339,457. M-to-M incentive distributions for FY 06/07 as of July 31, 2007, were \$4,457,690 to LRSD, \$4,329,372 to NLRSD, and \$11,056,440 to PCSSD. In March 2007, General Finance made the second one-third payment to the Districts for their FY 06/07 transportation budget. In September 2007, General Finance made the third one-third payment to the Districts for their FY 06/07 transportation budget. As of September 30, 2007, transportation payments for FY 06/07 totaled \$4,196,708 to LRSD, \$1,151,110 to NLRSD, and \$3,150,578 to PCSSD. In September 2007, General Finance made the first one-third payment to the Districts for their FY 07/08 transportation budget. As of September 30, 2007, transportation payments for FY 07/08 totaled \$1,401,197 to LRSD, \$409,917 to NLRSD, and \$1,127,985 to PCSSD. In July 2007, 16 new Magnet and M-to-M buses were delivered to the districts in Pulaski County. Finance paid Central States Bus Sales \$1,036,115. In July 2007, Finance paid the Magnet Review Committee \$92,500. This was the total amount due for FY 07/08. In July 2007, Finance paid the Office of Desegregation Monitoring \$200,000. This was the total amount due for FY 07/08.</p>
<i>II. Monitoring Compensatory Education</i>	<p>On July 12, 2007, the ADE Implementation Phase Working Group met to review the Implementation Phase activities for the previous quarter. Mr. Willie Morris, ADE Lead Planner for Desegregation, updated the group on all relevant desegregation issues. He handed out the syllabus of the U.S. Supreme Court ruling from June 28, 2007 about the Seattle School District. The court ruled that the district could no longer use race as the only criteria for making certain elementary school assignments and to rule on transfer requests. Mr. Scott Richardson from the Attorney General's Office said that an expert was going to study the Pulaski County school districts and see what they need to do to become unitary. The next Implementation Phase Working Group Meeting is scheduled for October 4, 2007 at 1:30 p.m. in room 201-A at the ADE.</p>

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE ACTIVITY	PMT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2007
<i>III. A Petition for Election for LRSD will be Supported Should a Millage be Required</i>	Ongoing. All court pleadings are monitored monthly.
<i>IV. Repeal Statutes and Regulations that Impede Desegregation</i>	In July 2007, the ADE sent letters to the school districts in Pulaski County asking if there were any new laws or regulations that may impede desegregation. The districts were asked to review laws passed during the 86 th Legislative Session, and any new ADE rules or regulations.
<i>V. Commitment to Principles</i>	On September 10, 2007, the Arkansas State Board of Education reviewed and approved the PMT and its executive summary for the month of August.
<i>VI. Remediation</i>	On February 9, 2007, ADE staff provided District Test Coordinator Training at the School for the Blind Auditorium in Little Rock. Two staff members from the LRSD and three staff members from the PCSSD attended.
<i>VII. Test Validation</i>	On February 12, 2001, the ADE Director provided the State Board of Education with a special update on desegregation activities.
<i>VIII. In-Service Training</i>	A Tri-District Staff Development Committee meeting was held on September 4, 2007. Staff from PCSSD, NLRSD, LRSD, AETN and the ADE attended. Mickey Kamer from AETN discussed the IDEAS professional development portal. Teachers can get on the internet at www.aetn.org/education and click on the IDEAS icon. They can register online and set up a free account. Teachers can take a pretest and use the prescriptive pathway to complete the lessons that they need, or they can use the learning pathway to complete all of the lessons in a course. Teachers take a post-test after the last lesson. If the teacher achieves 80% mastery on the post-test, they can receive certification. The superintendent of their school approves the professional development hours for the course taken. A teacher can only get credit for taking a course one time. The IDEAS Education Portal has 4000 accounts available for Arkansas teachers.
<i>IX. Recruitment of Minority Teachers</i>	In July 2007, ADE Professional Licensure mailed a list of Spring 2007 minority teacher graduates from Arkansas colleges and universities to the three Pulaski County school districts.

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE ACTIVITY	PMT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2007
<i>X. Financial Assistance to Minority Teacher Candidates</i>	Ms. Tara Smith of the Arkansas Department of Higher Education reported minority scholarships for Fiscal Year 2006-2007 on October 17, 2006. These included the State Teacher Assistance Resource (STAR) Program, the Minority Teacher Scholars (MTS) Program, and the Minority Masters Fellows (MMF) Program. The scholarship awards for STAR are as follows:
	STAR Male Male Female Female Total Total Race Count Award Count Award Count Award
	White 62 270,514 337 1,466,952 399 1,737,466
	Black 9 51,000 44 190,500 53 241,500
	Hispanic 1 6,000 4 21,000 5 27,000
	Native Amer 1 6,000 2 9,000 3 15,000
	Other 2 7,500 2 9,000 4 16,500
	Totals 75 341,014 389 1,696,452 464 2,037,466
	The scholarship awards for MTS are as follows:
	MTS Male Male Female Female Total Total Race Count Award Count Award Count Award
	Black 6 27,500 42 188,430 48 215,930
	Hispanic

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE ACTIVITY	PMT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2007
<i>XIII. Assist PCSSD</i>	Goal completed as of June 1995.
<i>XIV. Scattered Site Housing</i>	This goal is completed. No additional reporting is required.
<i>XV. Standardized Test Selection to Determine Loan Forgiveness</i>	Goal completed as of March 2001.
<i>XVI. Monitor School Improvement Plans</i>	<p data-bbox="656 485 1398 751">On August 17, 2007, ADE staff attended a meeting with Dr. Angela Olsen and Ms. Letipia Martin at the North Little Rock School District Office. Discussed the ACSIP rubric and how it is used to approve the building plans. Emphasis was placed on instructional activities, Federal program spending, school improvement status, responsibilities for Rose City and Lynch Drive and data input. Additional dates were set to conduct presentations for building staff.</p> <p data-bbox="656 787 1409 953">On August 21, 2007, ADE staff attended a meeting with the new director of Federal programs and the Title I coordinator at the PCSSD Central Office. Emphasis was placed on instructional activities that focus on improving weaknesses as identified by the supporting data, Federal programs and curriculum issues.</p> <p data-bbox="656 989 1390 1148">On August 28, 2007, ADE staff attended a meeting with the deputy superintendent, the director of secondary education, secondary principals, building ACSIP coordinators and the district learning services department at the Fuller Annex in the PCSSD. Teams worked on interventions and ideas for ACSIP.</p>

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE ACTIVITY	PMT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2007
<i>XVII. Data Collection</i>	<p>The ADE Office of Public School Academic Accountability has released the 2006 Arkansas School Performance Report (Report Card). The purpose of the Arkansas School Performance Report is to generally improve public school accountability, to provide benchmarks for measuring individual school improvement, and to empower parents and guardians of children enrolled in Arkansas public schools by providing them with the information to judge the quality of their schools. The Department of Education annually publishes a school performance report for each individual public school in the state, and distributes the report to every parent or guardian of a child in kindergarten through grade twelve (K-12) in the public schools of Arkansas. The annual school performance report is based on reliable statistical information uniformly required to be collected and submitted by each local school district to the department and published in a format that can be easily understood by parents or guardians who are not professional educators and distributed to the parents or guardians of children enrolled in the public schools via the postal service. Individual school reports are also made available via the Internet. Statistical information in the Arkansas School Performance Report is organized into the following seven essential accountability indicators: 1: ACHIEVEMENT, 2: ACCESS, 3: RETENTION, 4: DISCIPLINE, 5: DEMOGRAPHICS, 6: CHOICE, 7: ECONOMIC.</p>
<i>XVIII. Work with the Parties and ODM to Develop Proposed Revisions to ADE's Monitoring and Reporting Obligations</i>	<p>On July 10, 2002, the ADE held a Desegregation Monitoring and Assistance Plan meeting for the three school districts in Pulaski County. Mr. Willie Morris, ADE Lead Planner for Desegregation, presented information on the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. A letter from U.S. Secretary of Education, Rod Paige, was discussed. It stated that school districts that are subject to a desegregation plan are not exempt from the public school choice requirements. "If a desegregation plan forbids the school district from offering any transfer option, the school district should secure appropriate changes to the plan to permit compliance with the public school choice requirements". Schools in Arkansas have not yet been designated "Identified for Improvement". After a school has been "Identified for Improvement", it must make "adequate yearly progress". Schools that fail to meet the definition of "adequate yearly progress", for two consecutive years, must provide public school choice and supplemental education services. A court decision regarding the LRSD Unitary Status is expected soon. The LRSD and the NLRSD attended the meeting. The next meeting about the Desegregation Monitoring and Assistance Plan will be held in August, 2002, after school starts.</p>

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF DENIED WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
6302000	Benton Public School District	2	Stephanie Taylor	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	230 & 231		2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008
			Karen Stout	Early Childhood Education (P-4) Elementary (K-6)	Counselor	299		2007-2008
	Cave City Public School District	1	Angela Hightower	English Language Arts (7-12) Journalism (7-12) Drama (7-12)	Library Media Specialist	296		2007-2008
2402000	Charleston Public School District	2	Hilaree Farrell	English Language Arts (7-12) Social Studies (7-12)	Journalism Oral Communications	108 n/a		2007-2008
			Johnnie Whitman	Mathematics (7-12) Applied Math I (7-12) Applied Math II (7-12)	Business Technology	224		2007-2008
1101000	Corning Public School District	6	Susan Benton	Middle School English (5-8) Elementary (1-6)	Special Education	230		2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008
			Kelli Brickley	Early Childhood Education (P-4) Middle Childhood Education (4-8)	Special Education	230		2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008
			Karen Hodge	No License	Speech	208		2007-2008
			Chad Hovis	MidChLangArt/SS (4-8) Health Education (7-12) Secondary Physical Education (7-12) Coaching (7-12) Middle School Math (5-8) MidChSci/Math (4-8) Drivers Education Endorsement (7-12)	School Counseling	300		2006-2007 2007-2008

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF DENIED WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
			Caleb Thomas	MidChLangArt/SS (4-8)	Coaching	293		2007-2008
				MidChSci/Math (4-8)				
			Shelly Smith	Secondary Physical Education (7-12)	Physical Science	169		2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008
				PE/Wellness/LEI (7-12)				
				Coaching (P-8)				
6201000	Forrest City Public School District	1	Brandi Banks	Social Studies (7-12)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
2603000	Hot Springs Public School District	1	Jacqueline Graham	English Language Arts (7-12)	Middle School English	105		2007-2008
1608000	Jonesboro Public School District	1	Janice Crawford	No Arkansas License - GA License Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	231		2007-2008
				Grade 5-6 Endorsement (P-4)				
3405000	Jackson County Public School District	2	Brittany Churchman	MidChLangArt/SS (4-8)	Special Education	231		2007-2008
				MidChSci/Math (4-8)				
			Robert Summers	Business Technology (7-12)	Secondary Social Studies	167		2006-2007 2007-2008
				Career Preparation Endorsement (7-12)				
				CareerSerSpecPop (7-12)				
	Logan County Day Service Center	1	Amber Hooten	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	231		2004-2005 2005-2006 2006-2007
	Millcreek of Arkansas	1	Anthony Cox	Social Studies (7-12) Economics (7-12)	Special Education	230		2007-2008

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF DENIED WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
				Geography (7-12)				
				Psychology (7-12)				
	O.U.R. Educational Cooperative	2	Heather Hinrichs	Elementary (1-6)	Early Childhood Special Education	231		2006-2007 2007-2008
			Tina Edwards	Early Childhood Education (P-4)				2004-2005 2005-2006 2006-2007
				MidChLangArt/SS (4-8)	Early Childhood Special Education	231		
				MidChSci/Math (4-8)				
	Ouachita Public School District	1	Samantha Lowe	English Language Arts (7-12)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
	Ozark Mountain Public School District	5	Melanie Kelly	MidChLangArt/SS (4-8)	English (7-12)	166		2007-2008
				MidChSci/Math (4-8)	Drama/Speech (7-12)	208		
			Heather Cothran	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Library Media Science	295 & 296		2007-2008
			George Vincent	Middle School Physical Education (5-8)	Secondary Mathematics	200		2007-2008
				Coaching (7-12)				
				Middle School Math (5-8)				
				Middle School Science (5-8)				
			Gwendolyn Vance	Vocal Music (P-8)	Special Education	230		2006-2007 2007-2008
				Vocal Music (7-12)				
			Judith Watts	Business Technology (4-8)	Special Education	230		2006-2007 2007-2008
				Business Technology (7-12)				
	Pea Ridge Public School District	1	Patsy Williams	Elementary (1-6)	Special Education	231		2006-2007 2007-2008

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF DENIED WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
7009000	Strong-Huttig Public School District	1	Theresse Ball	Early Childhood Education (P-4) Elementary (K-6)	Special Education	230 & 231		2006-2007 2007-2008
	Total # of School Districts 15	Total # of Denied Waivers 28						

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
1701000	Alma Public School District	1	Sherrie Kuykendall	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Library Media Specialist	295 & 296		2007-2008
				Middle School Science (5-8)				
				Middle School Social Studies (5-8)				
				Elementary (K-6)				
	Bearden Public School District							
5201000		1	Shirley Willsey	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Reading	297		2007-2008
				Elementary (K-6)				
6302000	Benton Public School District	6	Nancy Lee	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	230		2006-2007 2007-2008
				Elementary (K-6)				
				SpEdEch Instructional Specialist (P-4)				
			David Hicks	Mathematics (7-12)	Special Education	230		2006-2007 2007-2008
			Roberta Wright	Elementary (1-6)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
			Morgan Roseberry	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Gifted & Talented	305 & 306		2007-2008
								2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008
			Tane Steed	Mathematics (7-12)	Art	201		
				Art (7-12)				
			Jacqueline Vergason	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Library Media Science	295 & 296		2006-2007 2007-2008
				Middle School Social Studies (5-8)				
				Elementary (K-6)				
2901000	Blevins Public School District	1	Tarah Gentry	English Language Art (7-12)	Oral Communication	n/a		2007-2008
	Bismark Public School District							
3001000		1	Justen Taggard	PE/Wellness/LEI (P-8)	Social Studies	167		2007-2008

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
				PE/Wellness/LEI (7-12)				
				Coaching (7-12)				
				Coaching (P-8)				
6601000	Booneville Public School District	1	Brian Dodson	Social Studies (7-12)	Coaching	293		2007-2008
6802000	Cave City Public School District	1	Jennifer Shaw	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	230		2006-2007 2007-2008
	Conway Human Development Center	1	Judy Buck	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	231		2006-2007 2007-2008
O101000	Dewitt Public School District	1	Jacqueline Duncan	Early Childhood Education (P-4) SpEdEch Instructional Specialist (P-4)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
7202000	Farmington Public School District	1	Crystal Swopes	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	230		2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008
7203000	Fayetteville Public School District	1	Lynda Brothers	English Language Arts (7-12)	Social Studies	167		2007-2008
6201000	Forrest City Public School District	1	David Scott	MidChLangArt/SS (4-8) Coaching (7-12) Social Studies (7-12) MidChSci/Math (4-8) PE/Wellness/Leisure (7-12) English as a Second Language (ESL) P-8 English as a Second Language (ESL) 7-12	Secondary Math	200		2007-2008
6601000	Fort Smith Public School District	5	Venita Fantroy	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	English as a Second Language (ESL)	307 & 308		2007-2008

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
				MidChLangArt/SS (4-8)				
				MidChSci/Math (4-8)				
			Jo-Ruth Strange	Day Trade (7-12)	Life/Earth Science	170		2007-2008
				Mathematics (7-12)				
				Drama/Speech (7-12)				
				Business Technology (7-12)				
				RadTVBroadcast (7-PS)				
				Work Placement Readiness (7-12)				
			Julie Tignor	English Language Arts (7-12)	English as a Second Language (ESL)	307 & 308		2007-2008
			Sarah Ashworth	Elementary (1-6)				
				Sp Ed Instructional Specialist (4-12)	Visual Specialist	232 & 234		2006-2007
				SpEdEch Instructional Specialist (P-4)				2007-2008
			Travis Biggs	Health Education (7-12)	Building Administrator			2007-2008
				Secondary Physical Education (7-12)				
				Coaching (7-12)				
				Drivers Education Endorsement (7-12)				
	Greene County Tech Public School							2005-2006
								2006-2007
								2007-2008
2807000	District	4	Mike Nunally	Social Studies (7-12)	Special Education	230		
			Jennifer Lewis	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	231		2006-2007
				Grade 5-6 Endorsement P-4				2007-2008
			Laura Robinson	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
			Leah Pillow	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	231		2007-2008
	Harmony Grove Public School District	3	Kristi Esch	Reading (1-12)	Counselor	299		2007-2008
				Elementary (1-6)				

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
			Gary Owens	Secondary Principal (5-12)	Special Education	230		2006-2007, 2007-2008
			Angela Pigott	Middle School Social Studies (5-8)	Art	201		2007-2008
				Elementary (1-6)				
5903000	Hazen Public School District	1	Julie Young	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	231		2007-2008
5803000	Hector Public School District	1	Sara Coffman	Social Studies (7-12)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
5403000	Helena-West Helena Public School District	1	Tiersha Freeman	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Art	201 & 202		2007-2008
3809000	Hillcrest Public School District	1	Amy Matthews	English Language Arts (7-12)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
3405000	Jackson County Public School District	3	Shane Jordan	PE/Wellness/LEI (P-8) PE/Wellness/LEI (7-12)	Secondary Social Studies	167		2007-2008
			Jennifer Medford	English Language Arts (7-12)	Middle School English	002		2007-2008
			Jillian Church	Physical/Earth Science (7-12)	Secondary Math	200		2007-2008
7003000	Junction City Public School District	2	Sharron Harris	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Elementary Art	201		2007-2008
				MidChLangArt/SS (4-8)				
				MidChSci/Math (4-8)				
				Elementary (1-6)				
			Mindy Sparks	English Language Arts (7-12)	Drama/Speech	207 & 208		2007-2008

[illegible]

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
				American History (5-8)				
				Geography (7-12)				
				Coach (7-12)				
				Assistant Coaching (7-12)				
				Coach other Sport (7-12)				
5703000	Mena Public School District	1	Celeste Ashcraft	English Language Arts (7-12) Family & Consumer Science (7-12)	Elementary Library	295		2007-2008
	Millcreek of Arkansas	6	Carolyn Harrington	Speech Therapy (K-12) Drama/Speech (7-12) Guidance Elementary (K-9)	Special. Education	230		2007-2008
			Jacki Garlington	Elementary (1-6)	Special Education	231		2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008
			Marsha Conzel	Elementary (1-6)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
			Patricia Robertson	Early Childhood Education (P-4) Grades 5-6 Endorsement from P-4	Special Education	230		2006-2007, 2007-2008
			MyCynthia Cochran	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
			Cathie Quarles	Middle School Science (4-8)	Special Education	230		2006-2007 2007-2008
1503000	Nemo Vista Public School District	1	Kimberly Amaro	Family & Consumer Science (7-12)	Career Orientation	N/A		2007-2008
	O.U.R Educational Cooperative	2	Amanda Blum	Early Childhood Education (P-4)	Early Childhood Special Education	231		2006-2007 2007-2008
			Lisa Cimino	Sp Ed Instructional Specialist (4-12)	Early Childhood Special Education	231		2006-2007 2007-2008

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
O407000	Pea Ridge Public School District	2	Misty Harris	English Language Arts (7-12)	Library Media Science	295 & 296		2006-2007 2007-2008
			Lavera Herndon	PE/Wellness/LEI (P-8) PE/Wellness/LEI (7-12)	Science	168		2007-2008
	Quitman Public School District	1	Justin Davis	PE/Wellness/LEI (P-8) PE/Wellness/LEI (7-12)	Social Studies	167		2007-2008
1106000	Rector Public School District	1	Jeffrey Snyder	Social Studies (7-12) Gifted & Talented (P-8) Gifted & Talented (P-8) Career Orientation Endorsement (7-12)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
O406000	Siloam Springs Public School District	1	Greg McBride	Life/Earth Science (7-12)	Physical/Earth Science	169		2007-2008
	South Side Bee Branch Public School District	2	James Ray	Bus Ed Vocational Endorsement (7-12) Business Technology (4-8) Business Technology (7-12) Sp Ed Instructional Specialist (4-12)	School Counseling	300		2007-2008
			George Knapp	MidChLangArt/SS (4-8) Social Studies (7-12) MidChSci/Math (4-8)	Special Education	230		2006-2007 2007-2008
	Vista Health-Fayetteville	1	Kent West	PE/Wellness/LEI (7-12)	Special Education	230		2007-2008
	Vista Health-Springdale	2	Shannon Doise	English Language Arts (7-12)	Special Education	230		2006-2007 2007-2008

LEA	NAME OF DISTRICT	# OF WAIVERS	NAME OF TEACHER(S)	CURRENT AREA(S) OF CERTIFICATION	OUT OF AREA TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	ALP CODE	OUT OF AREA ADMIN ASSIGNMENT	LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING OUT OF AREA
			Esther Reiter	Art (P-8) Art (7-12)	Special Education	230		2006-2007 2007-2008
	Western Yell County Public School District	1	Jennifer Musgrove-Hunt	English Language Art (7-12) Journalism (7-12)	Speech/Drama	208		2007-2008
	West Memphis Public School District	1	Koetter Little	Social Studies (7-12)	Coaching 7-12	293		2007-2008
	Total # of School Districts	39						
			Total # of School Districts					
		66	Total # of Waivers					

Section 1

Revolving Loans to School Districts

Pursuant to Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-20-802, school districts may borrow from the Revolving Loan Program for any of the following purposes:

- (1) Funding of its legally issued and outstanding postdated warrants;
- (2) Purchase of new or used school buses or refurbishing school buses;
- (3) Payment of premiums on insurance policies covering its school buildings, facilities, and equipment in instances where the insurance coverage extends three (3) years or longer; and replacement of or payment of the district's pro rata part of the expense of employing professional appraisers as authorized by § 26-26-1901 et seq. or other laws providing for the appraisal or reappraisal and assessment of property for ad valorem tax purposes;
- (4) Making major repairs and constructing additions to existing school buildings and facilities;
- (5) Purchase of surplus buildings and equipment;
- (6) Purchase of school sites for and the cost of construction thereon of school buildings and facilities and the purchase of equipment for the buildings;
- (7) Purchase of its legally issued and outstanding commercial bonds at a discount provided that a substantial savings in gross interest charges can thus be effected;
- (8) Refunding of all or any part of its legally issued and outstanding debt, both funded and unfunded;
- (9) Purchase of equipment;
- (10) Payment of loans secured for settlement resulting from litigation against a school district;
- (11) The purchase of energy conservation measures as defined in Title 6, Chapter 20, Subchapter 4; and
- (12) (A) The maintenance and operation of the school district in an amount equal to delinquent property taxes resulting from bankruptcies or receiverships of taxpayers and for loans to school districts in an amount equal to insured facility loss or damage when the insurance claim is being litigated or arbitrated.
(B) For purposes of this subdivision, the loans become payable and due when the final settlement is made, and the loan limits prescribed by § 6-20-803 shall not apply.

The maximum amount a school district may borrow is \$500,000 (A. C. A. § 6-20-803). Revolving loans are limited to a term of ten (10) years (A. C. A. § 6-20-806).

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
OCTOBER 8, 2007
APPLICATIONS FOR REVOLVING LOANS**

REVOLVING LOAN APPLICATIONS:

1	Construction	\$	75,000.00
1	School Bus		118,903.44
<hr/>			
2		\$	193,903.44

**SCHOOL DISTRICTS FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS
REVOLVING LOANS
CONSTRUCTION
RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

DISTRICT	COUNTY	ADM	AMOUNT OF APPLICATION	DEBT RATIO	TOTAL DEBT W/THIS APPLICATION	PURPOSE
Wickes	Polk	697	118,903.44	13.61%	4,422,552	Purchasing a house for superintendent

**SCHOOL DISTRICTS FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS
REVOLVING LOANS
SCHOOL BUS
RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

DISTRICT	COUNTY	ADM	AMOUNT OF APPLICATION	DEBT RATIO	TOTAL DEBT W/THIS APPLICATION	PURPOSE
Izard County Consolidated	Izard	538	75,000	7.93%	4,013,435	Purchasing 2 used school buses

Section 2

Second Lien Bonds

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-20-1229 (b) states the following:

(b) All second-lien bonds issued by school districts shall have semi-annual interest payments with the first interest payment due within eight (8) months of the issuance of the second-lien bond. All second lien bonds shall be repaid on payment schedules that are either:

- (1) Equalized payments in which the annual payments are substantially equal in amount; or
- (2) Decelerated payments in which the annual payments decrease over the life of the schedule.

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
OCTOBER 8,2007
APPLICATIONS FOR COMMERCIAL BONDS**

COMMERCIAL BOND APPLICATIONS:

4 2nd Lien	\$	10,290,000.00
<hr/>		<hr/>
4	\$	10,290,000.00

**SCHOOL DISTRICTS FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS
COMMERCIAL BONDS
2ND LIEN
RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

DISTRICT	COUNTY	ADM	AMOUNT OF APPLICATION	DEBT RATIO	TOTAL DEBT W/THIS APPLICATION	PURPOSE
Bauxite	Saline	1,232	1,045,000	16.78%	8,065,650	Completing the constructing and equipping of high school classrooms (\$200,000), elementary classrooms (\$100,000), high school PE gym (\$450,000), elementary PE gym (\$200,000), covered walkways (\$50,000), and cost of issuance and underwriter's discount allowance (\$45,000) with any remaining funds to be used for other capital projects and equipment purchases.
Booneville	Logan	1,459	3,865,000	19.52%	18,865,326	Erecting and equipping a multi-purpose building (\$3,613,750) and specialty building (\$138,855), and cost of issuance and underwriter's discount allowance (\$112,395) with any remaining funds to be used for constructing, refurbishing, remodeling, and equipping school facilities.
Hackett	Sebastian	628	750,000	16.45%	3,525,000	Constructing a classroom addition, renovating existing facilities and equipping facilities (\$716,250) and cost of issuance and underwriter's discount allowance (\$33,750).
Pulaski County Special	Pulaski	17,500	4,630,000	4.30%	79,984,593	Purchasing land in Sherwood and Maumelle (\$4,056,035), purchasing school buses (\$443,965), and cost of issuance and underwriter's discount allowance (\$130,000) with any remaining funds to be used for other capital projects and equipment purchases.

Section 3

Voted Bonds

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-20-1201 states the following:

All school districts are authorized to borrow money and to issue negotiable bonds for the repayment thereof from school funds for the building and equipping of school buildings, for making additions and repairs thereto, for purchasing sites therefore, for purchasing new or used school buses, for refurbishing school buses, the professional development and training of teachers or other programs authorized under the federally recognized Qualified Zone Academy Bond program, 26 U.S.C. 1397E, and for paying off outstanding postdated warrants, installment contracts, revolving loans, and lease-purchase agreements, as provided in this act.

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
OCTOBER 8, 2007
APPLICATIONS FOR COMMERCIAL BONDS**

COMMERCIAL BOND APPLICATIONS:

3 Voted	\$ 42,675,000.00
<hr/>	<hr/>
3	\$ 42,675,000.00

**SCHOOL DISTRICTS FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS
COMMERCIAL BONDS
VOTED
RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

DISTRICT	COUNTY	ADM	AMOUNT OF APPLICATION	DEBT RATIO	TOTAL DEBT W/THIS APPLICATION	PURPOSE
El Dorado	Union	4,408	20,700,000	6.23%	21,595,069	Constructing and equipping a new high school (\$20,200,000) and cost of issuance and underwriter's discount allowance (\$500,000) with any remaining funds to be used for other capital projects and equipment purchases.
Greene County Tech	Greene	3,436	20,350,000	16.45%	31,086,600	Building and equipping a new High School (\$19,881,950) and cost of issuance and underwriter's discount allowance (\$468,050) with any remaining funds to be used for other capital projects and equipment purchases.
Norfolk	Baxter	452	1,625,000	6.60%	2,959,200	Funding the District's portion of the following partnership projects: construct two additional classrooms and one multi-purpose PE room at the Elementary School (\$826,800) and library media center at the High School (\$733,200) and cost of issuance and underwriter's discount allowance (\$65,000) with any remaining funds to be used for other capital projects and equipment purchases.

The Arkansas Department of
Education

Five-Year Evaluation Report:

*Arkansas Regional
Education Service Cooperatives*

July 2007

Conducted for the
Arkansas Department of Education
#4 State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201

Charles D. Watson, Ed. D.
Associate Professor
University of Central Arkansas

Executive Summary
Arkansas Regional Service Cooperatives
Five-Year Report: July 2007
Prepared by Dr. Charles D. Watson

The network of Arkansas Regional Service Cooperatives was created by the Arkansas General Assembly in 1985 and since that time fifteen centers have provided support for Arkansas' public schools, the administrators and teachers who work in those schools, and direct services to many pre-school and school age students. Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 summarizes the statutes with amendments to the original authorization that provide for an evaluation study and review of each center every five years.

Dr. Charles Watson, former employee with the Arkansas Department of Education, was responsible for structuring the self-study that was conducted at each of the fifteen regional service cooperatives and assimilating a visiting committee, conducting the on-site visit, and preparing the summary report for each of the fifteen site visits. This Executive Summary provides a brief overview of the study conducted at each site during the spring of 2007. The full report containing recommendations for each cooperative is attached.

The reader is directed to the data table following the Summary, which presents numerical facts reflective of the basic services provided and the impact of professional development and direct services provided to pre-school children. Each cooperative has a common set of services including professional development for administrators and teachers; cooperative purchasing; media services; supervisory services for technology, special education, psychological evaluation, math/science/literacy coaching, and gifted and talented; services to special needs pre-school children; and support for career and technical education programs.

Annually, each cooperative conducts a needs assessment that helps the staff set priorities and to identify areas of work that should be included in programming for the coming year. As a result of these assessments new areas of work are established as the need is determined. The management of the cooperatives continually seek new and innovative ways of providing services and meeting the needs of the educators in the service territory. Travel time and time away from instruction during the school day continue to be challenges for providing high-quality professional development. Many cooperatives now provide sessions throughout the summer and school year via distance learning, which allow participants to minimize travel time but still fully participate.

The cooperatives demonstrate a collaborative attitude for working with the Arkansas Department of Education in implementing various educational endeavors. This spirit of cooperation is seen through the implementation of Smart Start, Smart Step and Next Steps. Additionally, some Department of Education staff members are housed in regions to afford state-level service closer to schools served by Department staff.

The spirit of collaboration and shared responsibility is visible as individual cooperatives initiate programming and invite participation from other areas of the state. Examples of such work includes formative assessments in which cooperatives come together and share development and implementation costs to create formative assessments and train teachers across the state to effectively use such assessments as a key component of the instruction process. Another area of collaboration is shared distance learning for high school students. Various cooperatives initiate distance learning courses and provide those courses to other sites across the state. These courses supplement the regular instructional program for students and in many cases provide required instruction in one or more of the required 38-units as outlined in Accreditation Standards for Arkansas Public Schools. These examples are not the only areas of collaborative programming.

Each program and each professional development session provided by the cooperatives is independently evaluated. These evaluations allow participants the opportunity to anonymously comment on a session's value. A review of those evaluation reports, almost without exception, note user satisfaction with the program offering often with suggestions for additional training needs.

Areas for consideration and review resulting from observations by the visiting committee(s):

- Since the initial authorizing legislation was passed by the Arkansas General Assembly and the network of regional service cooperatives was created, minimal restructuring has taken place. During this time significant shifts have occurred in student enrollment in several regions of the state. Enrollment across the Arkansas Delta has decreased, while enrollment in the Northwest corridor has significantly increased. Act 60 of 2003 reduced the number of local school districts through annexation and consolidation. Throughout these shifts in demographics, the structure of the regional service cooperatives has remained virtually unchanged.
- Among the education community, the cooperatives have high visibility and recognition for the work they do; however, many business and professional members of the visiting teams suggested communities are not generally aware of the work of the cooperatives and the overall contribution to support public schools and educators in the region served.
- A very small percentage of the overall operational budget of each regional service cooperative is based on the state funding allocation for each cooperative. As much as 94% of some budgets depend on state, federal, or private grant funding. Thus annually, staff members must write new grants and/or develop evaluation reports and submit continuation applications. Staff members hired to work in grant-funded programs are always subject to reduction in force when or if such funding is no longer available. Most

cooperative directors affirm that the grant funding structure has not significantly impacted the ability to hire and retain highly qualified staff.

- There is a major difference in fiscal facilities at locations throughout the state. At this point at least three regional centers are housed in facilities previously vacated by local districts or in buildings lacking space to maximize services provided. Efforts to keep those centers visually and structurally viable do not diminish the need for alternate facilities. This report affirms a verbal report made to a joint meeting of cooperative directors and teacher center coordinators challenging directors to work together to share ideas for funding of facilities and for newer staff members to utilize the talent, expertise and leadership of those with longer tenured service as a way of planning for meeting the facilities needs in those identified areas.

Without question, the visiting team members for each of the fifteen sites strongly affirmed that each regional service cooperative met or exceeded the legislative requirements as set forth in statutes; each entity was staffed with a cadre of highly qualified professionals who are committed to improving student performance; and services provided are critical for most local school districts and their faculties to meet state accreditation and professional licensure standards.

*Arkansas Regional Service Cooperatives
2005-2006 School Year Data*

Criteria	Counties served	Districts Served	Total Campuses	Teachers Served	Students Enrolled	Workshops	Participants	Pre-School Children Served
Arch Ford	6	26	98	4,204	40,586	371	9,973	764
Arkansas River	4	9	68	1,775	25,773	173	2,313	1,178
Crowley's Ridge	6	25	98	3,233	38,841	628	12,675	400
Dawson	6	24	83	3,323	40,401	537	9,381	434
DeQueen/Mena	5	13	43	1,291	13,349	343	5,946	195
Great Rivers	5	10	37	1,605	18,815	275	4,199	424
Northcentral	7	17	37	1,616	18,664	330	5,694	241
Northeast	6	14	56	1,733	16,729	464	8,347	547
Northwest	3	16	124	4,567	69,417	492	8,632	796
Ozarks Unlimited	8	16	56	1,787	15,571	368	5,308	718
South Central	4	13	49	1,866	17,137	528	8,717	460
Southeast Arkansas	7	13	50	1,849	17,355	378	12,311	1,188
Southwest Arkansas	4	10	35	1,412	13,186	465	5,787	482
Western	6	21	106	4,040	43,427	441	7,548	298
Wilbur D. Mills	4	16	64	2,200	27,212	618	16,465	1,123
Totals	81	243	1,004	36,501	416,463	6,411	123,296	9,248

*Arkansas Regional Service Cooperatives
2005-2006 School Year Data*

Cell: F3

Comment: cwatson:

Of this total, 4,514 are from the Department of Corrections School District

Cell: I3

Comment: cwatson:

Pre-school children are served through Arkansas Better Chance (ABC) Programs, HIPPY, and special education services for handicapped children.

Not all cooperatives operate the same pre-school programs.

Cell: C13

Comment: cwatson:

Southeast Arkansas serves schools outside the established cooperative area in the following ways:

Hampton School District - Workforce Education

Arkansas AmeriCorps Teacher Recruitment available to all districts

North Little Rock and Stuttgart Districts - formative assessment

Stuttgart, Camden Fairview, and DeWitt Districts - Math consortium

Arkansas Early College High School - 36 high schools across the state

Cell: B17

Comment: cwatson:

The total number of counties served exceeds 75 due to fact that schools in some counties are served by more than one regional service cooperative.

Evaluation Summary
Arch Ford Education Service Cooperative
Wednesday, April 11, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Arch Ford Education Service Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

This sub-committee reviewed documents detailing the governance and administrative structure of the Arch Ford Education Service Cooperative and interviewed the Director to determine that there is a strong working relationship between cooperative administration, staff and the Executive Committee. The committee noted that there is seldom a change in the officers as elected by the Executive Committee, thus the structure of the governing body may not always follow the requirements of 6-13-1007 3(c), which suggests a three-year staggered term for members of the Executive Committee. Otherwise, the materials reviewed and interviews conducted suggest that the governance of the cooperative meets or exceeds statutory requirements.

Recommendations:

- The Executive Committee and cooperative administration should address the issue of elected officers of the Executive Committee serving three-year staggered terms.

Program

This sub-committee reviewed the Program Section materials provided and interviewed cooperative administrators and program staff and local area superintendents and representatives of the Teacher Center Committee. The sub-committee found that the programs provided were in keeping with the needs assessment of local schools. We also found the programs are being planned and managed in keeping with state statutes.

The Cooperative demonstrates a high level of collaboration with local universities and both member and non-member districts. The professional culture is evident and supported by strong staff commitment.

The Cooperative exceeds state statutes as evidenced by their desire to go above and beyond member school needs by providing:

- A cadre of teachers of technology
- Focus testing
- Assistance to schools in school improvement as determined by No Child Left Behind
- Support for English as a second language (ESL) students.

The sub-committee supports the need as identified by the schools and cooperative staff to expand services for secondary schools. Services for literacy and mathematics are available, but there will be an increased need for science as new science assessments are implemented at the state level.

Recommendations:

- Consideration should be given to providing additional services for teachers in the content areas of mathematics and science. These services could be provided by establishing a center for science and mathematics at the cooperative and staffing the center with content area specialists. (Some services are currently available through a center located on another campus but schools are seeking more time and more in-depth services.)

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This sub-committee reviewed many documents relating to the fiscal management and personnel management of the cooperative, which included Board minutes, personnel policy handbooks, state audit reports, and inventories and finds that this area of the study meets and generally exceeds requirements as provided in statutes.

In the self-study, the staff advanced the needs for formalizing a community of learners among the administrative and program staff. This committee supports the tenets of this recommendation, but believes that many components of a community of learners currently exists in that staff members interviewed all demonstrated an understanding of the "big picture" of operation and management of the cooperative.

Recommendation:

- Continue the work to formalize a community of learners among the administration and program staff; however, don't lose the collegial atmosphere that surrounds the work and workers where all staff members feel that they are an important part of the work of the cooperative.

Visiting Committee
Arch Ford Education Service Cooperative
101 Bulldog Drive
Plumerville, AR 72127

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Ms. Kim Ballard Clarksville School District
Administrator	Ms. Leasha Hayes, Principal Rose Bud Elementary School Rose Bud School District
College/University Representative	Mr. Glenn Sheets College Staff Arkansas Tech University
Cooperative Employee	Ms. Elaine Cowling, Retired DeQueen/Mena Education Cooperative
School Board Member	Mr. Leon Anderson, Board of Directors Russellville School District
Business/Industry Representative	Ms. Kathlyn Arnett First Security Bank
Parents	Ms. Charlotte Green Ms. Amy Burchfield

Evaluation Summary
Arkansas River Education Service Cooperative
Thursday, May 24, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Arkansas River Education Service Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

A review of the Self-Study, performance reports, other documents and interviews with the Director support the finding that the Arkansas River Education Service Cooperative meets or exceeds legislative requirements with possibly one exception. Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1005 states that cooperatives will be established so that they include at least ten (10) but not more than thirty-five (35) school districts. When the cooperative was established it clearly met that requirement. However, with local school consolidations and at least one district requesting to be served by another of the regional service cooperatives, Arkansas River Education Service Cooperative now serves seven (7) local school district, the Department of Corrections School District and the Arkansas School for the Deaf, which is a total of nine (9) entities. This committee supports the organizational structure of the region and notes that the cooperative continues to serve in excess of the 20,000 students in the region. Additionally, this cooperative serves a geographic region of Arkansas that is economically impoverished and continues to experience declining enrollments.

Due to the number of member school districts, the Cooperative Board makes executive decisions, thus there is no need for a separate executive committee.

The scope of work for the cooperative appears to be consistent with the documented needs of school and students served by the cooperative.

This Committee endorses the recommendations made within the self-study, which will be reflected in the Program Committee summary.

The Committee commends the work of the cooperative as it relates to becoming a productive component of the Pine Bluff/Jefferson County community. That community support was evidenced by the attendance of the Mayor and other community leaders during the luncheon session.

Program

This sub-committee reviewed needs-assessment summaries, programming provided for schools and students, evaluations of work accomplished and interviewed staff to further document work accomplished by the staff. It is noted that the position of a teacher-center director/assistant director has just been hired and on the job a few days.

The work of Dr. Anderson in procuring, processing, distributing instructional materials, books and other items through the cooperative is truly commendable.

The committee noted the many volumes of print material and other instructional volumes that are made available to teachers, parents and others as well as global outreach is truly commendable.

Much of the programming for the cooperative is focused on meeting the instructional needs of teachers in Delta area schools. Equally notable is the services to students who are seeking GED or services to young mothers who receive direct support and tutoring to assist with childcare and supplemental instruction to help with performance in the classroom.

Upon review of the programs and print materials provided, the committee believes that the program components as offered through Arkansas River Education Service Cooperative meets or exceeds the legislative requirements.

Recommendations:

- Consideration should be given to increasing participation of secondary teachers in the professional development provided by the cooperative. Attendance data from a number of sessions listed five or fewer participants, many with zero. It is noted that the mathematics specialist focuses most of her work at the elementary and middle grades levels. Some collaboration was evidenced with the regional center, which is housed at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff.
- Additional professional development in the content areas, especially for secondary teachers should be included in the program component of the cooperative's work.
- Consider structuring sessions for "job alike" groups during professional development training events.
- Expand the use of compressed video for the delivery of professional development. This would minimize travel time and expenses for schools and/or individual participants.
- Minimize the time teachers and administrators are away from classrooms to participate in professional development events.
- Give consideration to adding additional staff with the focus of work being on secondary academic performance.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This sub-committee reviewed many documents relating to the fiscal management and personnel management of the cooperative, which included Board minutes, personnel policy handbooks, state audit reports, and inventories and finds that this area of the study meets and generally exceeds requirements as provided in statutes.

Recommendation:

- Find a way within the budget to create more opportunities for positive communication with and between the cooperative and the local districts.

**Visiting Committee
Arkansas River Education Cooperative
912 West Sixth Avenue
Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71601**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member	Dr. Charles Watson, Program Manager Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Ms. Barbara Hubanks Dollarway Middle School Dollarway School District
Administrator	Ms. Rhonda Saunders Supervisor, Early Childhood Special Education, ADE
College/University Representative	Dr. Calvin Johnson, Dean of Education University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff
Cooperative Employee	Ms. Allison Kelley Southeast AR Education Service Co-op.
School Board Member	Rev. Willie R. Norful, Sr.
Business/Industry Representative	Mr. Archie Sanders State Farm Insurance
Parents	Ms. Barbara Ann Hollis Ms. Sabrina Taylor

Evaluation Summary
Crowley's Ridge Educational Service Cooperative
Tuesday, May 8, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Crowley's Ridge Educational Service Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

This sub-committee reviewed the documents provided from the self-study, minutes of Board of Director's meetings, financial documents, and interviewed Cooperative staff and the chair of the Board of Directors and find that the Crowley's Ridge Educational Service Cooperative meets or exceeds expectations for operation and governance as defined in statutes. The sub-committee noted that the mission and vision of the Cooperative continues to reflect ideals established with the formation of the Cooperatives in 1985: professional development, media services, teacher evaluation, cooperative purchasing and other services ad determined by the member schools.

Each year the Cooperative staff conducts a needs assessment so that the services provided continue to reflect the identified needs of the member schools.

The Cooperative is now housed in a new structure designed and constructed as an economic development project for the Harrisburg community. Previously, the Cooperative was housed in a formerly abandoned school building, which needed much repair and did not provide a facility conducive to productive employment nor a meeting place for events sponsored by the Cooperative. A local Harrisburg public facilities board was established and the facility was constructed with a rural development loan though the City of Harrisburg. The City leases the facility to the Cooperative, thus local business and professional community members understood the financial benefit of having the Cooperative located within the City of Harrisburg.

Since opening last year, the facility has been used occasionally by City events, which the Director and staff want to expand in the near future.

Recommendations:

- Explore ways to more effectively provide information to the communities served by the Center as to its mission and to the services provided to local school districts, administrators, teachers and students.
- Continue to build the partnership with the Harrisburg community and explore additional opportunities to showcase the new facility and increase awareness of the work of the Cooperative.

Program

This sub-committee affirmed that the Program component of the self-study is truly driven by the needs of teachers, administrators from member schools and districts in the service area. Each year a needs assessment is conducted; however, the Committee observed that it has been several years since many of the items on the assessment have been revised and updated.

The sub-committee reviewed other materials provided through the self-study as well as evaluation documents from users of professional development and other services provided. The Committee affirms that the required components of the program area are being met or exceeded as defined by legislation.

Recommendations:

- Give careful attention to updating the annual needs assessment instrument and once information is returned, staff should work together to prepare an action plan keyed toward the framing of local district needs and incorporating them into an individual training plan for each district. The Committee notes that perhaps many districts will have similar needs, thus whenever appropriate combine similar elements.
- Consider options for additional training opportunities for high school faculty especially in the areas of mathematics and science.
- Update teacher center materials or determine that this service is no longer needed and explore ways of meeting some of those needs in another manner.
- Explore the option(s) for devoting more attention to grant writing and grant administration. Given that a major percentage of the Cooperative's budget is dependent on grants, then a more formal process for preparing grants should be considered.
- Continue to use the resources of the community to expand and support Cooperative activities and events.
- Continue to find new and different ways of "advertising" or sharing the work of the Cooperative with Harrisburg residents and patrons from other communities served by the Center.

- Update the Cooperative Web-site and revisit the overall technology utilization plan for the staff.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This sub-committee reviewed fiscal records, budgets, audit reports and interviewed the Cooperative director and bookkeeper to determine that fiscal management is becoming more stable. It is noted that less than 10% of the income is from state sources; the remainder is based on fees for services or grants secured from state, federal or private sources. Much staff time has to be devoted to grant procurement and administration given the financial structure that is in place.

One area of concern that emerged from interviews with staff and the Director is that of reimbursement for staff travel. With the wide-spread geographical area served, each staff member travels four and sometimes five days each week. Also, many staff travel in the same direction or to the same schools at the same time. There is apparently no strategy in place or under consideration that would help minimize travel expenses.

Recommendations:

- Explore ways to minimize travel of staff to the same areas whenever possible. This would result in significant cost savings to the cooperative and the program areas.
- Expand the use of technology to conduct meetings and professional development for teachers and administrators throughout the region. This would reduce travel costs and increase the efficiency of staff.
- Utilize local resources – teachers and/or administrators – to provide some of the professional development when feasible to reduce travel costs and reduce fees paid to out-of-state consultants.
- Consider the services of a grant writer or a grant development team composed of current staff who would devote specific energies to seeking grant funds or redirecting funds once a program changes focus. Example: the tobacco settlement grant is no longer being funded.
- Consider hosting more professional development sessions in local schools to minimize the number of teachers who travel to sessions or to reduce the distance traveled.

**Visiting Committee
Crowley's Ridge Education Cooperative
1606 Pine Grove Lane
Harrisburg, AR 72432**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Andy Barrett Harrisburg High School Harrisburg School District
Administrator	Darrel Smith Superintendent Wynne School District
College/University Representative	Dr. Dennis White, Chairman Department of Communication Studies Arkansas State University
Cooperative Employee	Donna Harris, Assistant Director Northeast Arkansas Education Cooperative
School Board Member	Charles Nix, President Harrisburg School District
Business/Industry Representative	Mauria Morgan Owner Turfgrass Company
Parents	June Long Mark Weston

Evaluation Summary
Dawson Education Cooperative
Friday, February 16, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Dawson Education Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

It is the conclusion of the Historical Perspective and Governance Committee that the Dawson Education Cooperative has managed and organized the work of the Cooperative to exceed established legislative expectations. This Committee reviewed the self-study materials, performance reports, Executive Board minutes and historical documents, and interviewed cooperative recipients and believes that the materials presented accurately reflect the beliefs of clients served throughout the region. Thus, we believe that Dawson Education Cooperative exceeds the expectation in meeting historical and emerging needs of the districts and the children served.

Program

The strength of Dawson Education Cooperative is the personnel and their willingness to serve the member districts both on-site and at the district level. The cooperative addresses a wide variety of content needs that meets or exceeds what is required by law concerning programs. The cooperative has cutting-edge technology centers and distance learning opportunities that continue to expand. The cooperative provides an array of programs and services to all member districts. A review of user evaluation reports indicated that participants in professional development believe that services meet their needs and evaluate the quality of service very high.

Recommendations:

- Expand the high school opportunities to include content specialists for math, literacy and science. That nation and state are beginning to focus on high school redesign. Those added content specialists could provide additional technical support for high school teachers and increase participation of teachers from those grade levels
- Explore the possibility of offering Arkansas Better Chance pre-schools to the cooperative members schools. Research indicates that pre-school is an important area for closing the achievement gap.
- Design a formal on-line survey for professional development needs. Include the opportunity for teachers to address areas from the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan and personal interest for professional growth.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This sub-committee finds that the Dawson Education Cooperative is managing its fiscal resources effectively in order to meet its goals and objectives to assist schools to meet accreditation standards, have access to educational resources,

and assisting with coordination between the school/district and the Arkansas Department of Education. The sub-committee finds that the Cooperative is managing fiscal resources and allocating those resources in a responsible manner that aligns with all pertinent legislation. The sub-committee notes that the majority of the operational budget for this cooperative is based on grant funds, which requires staff to continually be engaged in proposal development and a search for additional funds.

Recommendation:

- Continue to work with the legislative process to increase the percent of the budget that is not from grants or grant dependent funding.
- Seek sources of funds that will allow expansion of staff to meet more of the needs of high school faculty.
- Give priority for expansion of staff to content specialists that will service professional development for high school teachers.

**Visiting Committee
Dawson Education Service Cooperative
711 Clinton Street
Arkadelphia, AR 71923**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member, Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson, Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Deborah Propps Nashville School District
Administrator	Dr. Natalie Sherwood Assistant Superintendent DeQueen School District
College/University Representative	Dr. Charlotte Robertson University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Cooperative Employee	Ms. Kathy Heagwood DeQueen-Mena Cooperative
School Board Member	Judy Blackwood Ouachita School District
Business/Industry Representative	Mr. Elton Buck Summit Bank
Parents	Mr. Brett Chancellor Ms. Scarlett Williams

Evaluation Summary
DeQueen/Mena Educational Cooperative
Wednesday, February 28, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from DeQueen/Mena Educational Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

It is the conclusion of the Historical Perspective and Governance Committee that the DeQueen/Mena Educational Cooperative is in complete compliance with the requirements of organization and governance as outlined in statute and reported in the self-study documentation. This Committee reviewed the self-study materials, performance reports, Executive Board minutes and historical documents, and interviewed cooperative recipients and believes that the materials presented accurately reflect the beliefs of clients served throughout the region. Thus, we believe that Dawson Education Cooperative exceeds the expectation in meeting historical and emerging needs of the districts and the children served.

Program

This sub-committee reports that the programs offered by the Cooperative are relevant to the needs reported by the schools and clients in the region. The committee commends the staff for providing a wide variety of offerings. The self-study, which included reports from surveys to user groups throughout the region, presents a clear summary of stated need for programs. The Committee believes that the staff makes every effort to meet the identified needs.

The Committee endorses the recommendations identified in the self-study and provides the following additional suggested program enhancements when funds are available.

- Consider periodic opportunities for local school media specialists to be acquainted with new and updated equipment and materials available through the Cooperative Resources Center.
- Continue to add resources and training for teachers in the area of Hispanic culture.
- Continue and extend training that focuses on economically disadvantaged populations such as materials developed by Dr. Ruby Payne.
- Pursue funds that will allow the expansion of the behavioral intervention program to kindergarten classes.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This sub-committee finds that the DeQueen/Mena Educational Cooperative meets or exceeds all requirements and recommendations in the areas of fiscal management, budget and personnel as noted in statutes. The Committee notes the efficient and productive working relationship that exists between Cooperative staff and administration with local school district staff and administration, the attention to detail and accuracy in fiscal accounting and management, and the overall highly qualified staff, which appears committed and dedicated to improvement of performance for students and schools in this region of the state.

Recommendations:

- As additional funding becomes available, consideration should be given to additional services in the area of testing and data analysis. These services would further increase accountability and improve student performance on Benchmark and other required tests.
- Give priority to employment of a secondary mathematics specialist and a secondary science specialist
- Continue and increase services to schools in the area of group purchasing for supplies and equipment.

**Visiting Committee
DeQueen/Mena Education Cooperative
Post Office Box 110
Gillham, AR 71841**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Ms. Gena Anderson North Main Elementary Greenwood School District
Administrator	Mr. Donis Smead Superintendent Mountain Pine School District
College/University Representative	Dr. Charles Green, Staff Member Henderson State University
Cooperative Employee	Ms. Beth Neel Dawson Education Service Cooperative
School Board Member	Ms. Sandy Huntsberger, Board of Directors DeQueen/Mena School District
Business/Industry Representative	Mrs. Alisha Lewis, Marketing/Pr Officer First National Bank of DeQueen
Parents	Mrs. Cynthia Lance Mrs. Heather Spencer

Evaluation Summary
Great Rivers Education Service Cooperative
Wednesday, February 21, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Great Rivers Educational Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

This sub-committee reviewed the requirements of the legislation regarding the historical perspective and governance of the Great Rivers Education Service Cooperative. Each of the items in the self-study was examined as well as additional documentation provided to the Committee. The self-study documents included responses to Sections in Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-13-1004, 6-13-1005, 6-13-1006, and 6-13-1007. The Committee found that the Great Rivers Cooperative meets or exceeds the requirements of these statutes. Each item was supported by documentation with references to approval by the Cooperative Board of Directors.

The Committee does not find that recommendations are necessary for this area of the evaluation.

Program

This Sub-Committee reviewed documents provided through the self-study materials as well as conducted interviews with various staff members, local school administrators and teachers who utilize the services of the program areas of the Cooperative. This Committee finds that the self-study documents for programs managed by the Cooperative are comprehensive and reflect a fair and accurate status of the programs provided.

The self-study listed recommendations that should be considered extended services and should be considered when and if additional funds are available.

Recommendations:

- The Committee supports the documented need for additional staff to provide programming for high school teachers especially in the areas of literacy, mathematics and science.
- Since a large proportion of the programming for the Cooperative is dependent on securing grants from state and federal sources, consideration should be given to funding a position that would focus energies on grant writing and grant procurement.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This Sub-Committee perceived its role as establishing the extent to which the Cooperative was meeting its stated goals in the areas of fiscal management, budget and personnel. The Committee concludes that the Great Rivers

Education Service Cooperative is meeting its stated goals toward maintaining good fiscal management practices, following annual item budget closely and following good personnel management practices.

Recommendations:

- Review the Grievance Procedure section of the Personnel Policy Manual, the first step in the Grievance Procedure should specify or clarify where the ten-day grievance presentation period starts. This will assist in off-setting the time-line confusion in the grievance procedure.
- Consideration should be given to adding a personal growth model option to the annual personnel performance evaluation of all employees. The employee's immediate supervisor can discuss Professional Growth Plan or Individual Improvement Plan options, which will enable staff to take an active role in self-evaluation and growth.
- In this era of technology and with all the technology available to staff and in the school, the administration of the Cooperative should carefully consider moving to electronic transmission of Board materials, Minutes etc.
- In support of program expansion as defined in the self-study, the next staff expansion should be toward high school professional development with emphasis on reading, mathematics and science.

**Visiting Committee
Great Rivers Education Service Cooperative
Post Office Box 2837
West Helena, AR 72390**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Karen Reyna Rogers School District
Administrator	Kathy Lee Assistant Superintendent Wynne School District
College/University Representative	Julie Lane Phillips Community College
Cooperative Employee	Dennis Martin, Director Northcentral Education Service Cooperative
School Board Member	Larry Wilson Helena School District
Business/Industry Representative	Larry Denson, Sr.
Parents	Tameko Miller Diana Jones

Evaluation Summary
Northcentral Arkansas Education Service Center
Monday, May 7, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Northcentral Arkansas Education Service Center conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

This sub-committee reviewed the self-study documents, interviewed the Center director and members of the Board of Directors. It is noted that all eligible school districts (seventeen) in the established service area are fully participating members with the superintendent of each local district serving on the Board of Directors. The Board meets regularly and minutes of those meetings are maintained and were made available for review by the visiting committee.

The members of this committee avow that the statutes defining historical perspective and governance are met or exceeded.

The Center has established partnerships with the area community college and continually explores ways to expand the cooperation between the institutions.

In the self-study document the Center staff noted that more emphasis could and should be placed on providing information to the communities served by the cooperative. Local business representatives confirmed their limited knowledge about the mission of the Center, thus supported the need for more community awareness.

Recommendations:

- Explore ways to effectively provide information to the communities served by the Center as to its mission and to the services provided to local school districts, administrators, teachers and students.
- Continue to build partnerships with other post secondary institutions in the area.

Program

This sub-committee reviewed data presented by the Center through the self-study and the displays prepared for the committee. Additionally, the committee interviewed the teacher center director, various program managers and representatives of the teacher-center committee. It is the belief of this committee that all areas of the self-study were addressed and the programming meets or exceeds the expectations as outlined in legislation. Additionally, the Center staff conducts an annual needs survey to identify areas of need or interest from administrators and teachers. The results of this needs assessment is used to plan professional development activities during the summer and subsequently during the school year.

This committee is pleased to report that the program component of the work of the Center is staffed by educational professional who are committed to meeting the needs of teachers and administrators in the service area and do so in an accommodating, energetic and caring way.

It was noted by the committee that several staff members share a common office with very minimal storage and work space. Most of these staff members work in the rapidly expanding early childhood program. Additional office and work space for this program is underway and should be ready prior to the opening of school in August.

Recommendations:

- The committee concurs with the self-study document and supports the need for additional staff to work in the area of secondary mathematics and science as a first priority and other support for high school teachers in other disciplines should also be considered as funding becomes available.
- One area of work that would be addressed by additional staff would be to develop content alignment with the new secondary mathematics frameworks.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This committee chooses to begin its summary by noting that between six and seven percent of the operational budget are received for state allocated funds, the remainder are funds from entitlement and competitive grants either from the state, federal and/or private funding sources. This means that much of the staff's time is spend either in generating proposals seeking funds or reporting of activities of funded grants. Although \$40,000 new state dollars are anticipated in the next biennium, that is a far cry from the resources needed to maintain the efficient operation noted at this Center.

The director and staff have demonstrated acceptable practices in all areas of the report. As with audits, the Center has had no exceptions, outside of segregation of duties, since 2003. Reporting of fiscal and some program operations is through APSCN and through electronic reporting for special education services.

The cooperative makes no assessment of local districts for dues or basic fees. There are fees charged for participation in some events throughout the work of the program staff.

The facilities are relatively new, but program expansion has necessitated further expansion. A new addition to the building is under construction. Revolving loan funds from the state were secured to provide funding for a major part of the construction costs. Other funds were from non-restricted fund balances accrued over the past several years.

**Visiting Committee
Northcentral Arkansas Education Service Center
Post Office Box 739
Melbourne, AR 72556**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Kay Brogdon Highland School District
Administrator	Dan Foley Superintendent Batesville School District
College/University Representative	Dr. Dusty Johnston, President Ozarka College
Cooperative Employee	Rodger Harlan, Director Wilbur Mills Education Service Cooperative
School Board Member	Robert Hutchinson Cave City School District
Business/Industry Representative	Mike Cone First National Bank of Sharp County
Parents	Kelly Powell Gary Hughes

Evaluation Summary
Northeast Arkansas Education Cooperative
Wednesday, March 14, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Northeast Arkansas Education Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

The Northeast Arkansas Education Cooperative meets and often exceeds the legislative guidelines provided. The Cooperative Board meets regularly and appears to have open communication between members of the Board and Cooperative administration and staff. Documentation of past years work is well maintained and accessible. There appears to be interest in developing and preserving archival records. The sub-committee notes that one district served by the cooperative is located well beyond the 50 mile radius, which necessitates longer travel time for teachers in that district to attend professional development sessions and other events provided by the cooperative.

Recommendations

The sub-committee endorses the self-study identified needs and recommendations:

- Increase base funding to assure management of services and programming to meet the needs of schools and teachers in this service region.
- Provide for preservation of archival data by dedicating staff time or employing a staff member to serve as a historian.

Additional recommendations

- Consider providing some professional development sessions or meetings at sites other than in Walnut Ridge to accommodate teachers who reside/work on the fringes of the service area.
- Fine-tune the surveys to pinpoint specific needs for workshop offerings.

Program

The Program Sub-Committee finds that the Northeast Arkansas Education Cooperative meets or exceeds the legislative intent as outlined in statutes and objectives set forth for programming by the Cooperative Board of Directors.

The sub-committee observed documentation and program descriptions identifying a large array of programs and services based on identified needs established by the annual needs assessment completed by teachers, administrators and other users of these services. The needs assessment process

is tied closely to the needs as identified by the local districts' ACSIP Plans and the teacher professional growth plans. These programs satisfactorily serve the identified needs and interests of the users of these services. It is noted that a wide variety of high quality professional development services are provided and there is evidence of collegial cooperation among the member schools, colleges and universities, as well as businesses in the community. Cooperation is especially noted between the Cooperative and Williams Baptist College when additional space is needed for meetings.

The facilities serve the Cooperative and its services well.

The Committee notes that state funding has not been increased for several years, which means that programming and extended services must be provided through grants or pooled resources from local districts.

Recommendations:

- Explore options for providing additional revenue to support the technology initiatives – both programming and staffing
- Work toward providing additional services in the content area of science by employing an in-house science specialist
- Work toward getting the teacher center materials request and video request on line
- Consider the options of an internship program with partner colleges and universities.
- As funds are available consider updating the media resources to provide more current topics and move the format to DVD.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

The staff has been extremely helpful to this sub-committee as it reviewed the materials provided and the self-study documents in the areas of finance and personnel. The committee received positive feedback from school superintendents, principals, and Teacher Center Committee members regarding the many services offered at the Northeast Arkansas Educational Cooperative and its administrative management. The committee noted that personnel documents were up-to-date and files reflect attention to detail in maintaining accurate and complete documentation in these areas.

The committee commends the staff for its attention to audit recommendations and recommendations from the previous program review from five years ago.

Recommendations

- Provide the same year's data for the legislative audit, budget, financial report, and annual report in order to see the "big picture." The committee had to look at three different years' data to see all of the required documents.
- Explore and adopt administrative procedures that allows staff to maintain up-to-date information when comparing expenditures for the budget year, obligations and the year, and balances. Periodic reporting from the bookkeeping staff to program managers would be one way to implement this recommendation.
- While personnel policies are being updated, this would be a good time to review all aspects of the personnel handbook and revise where needed. Once the personnel policies have been adopted, adopt a procedure whereby each staff member is issued a copy and staff members have the opportunity to ask for clarification of any item in the policy. Also adopt a procedure for document that every staff member has received the personnel policy. Some areas for consideration in the personnel policy update:
 - Adding provision for Family Medical Leave Act
 - Workplace violence policy
 - More adequate display of building evacuation route(s)
 - A written procedure for annual personnel evaluation and structure for carrying out the annual personnel evaluations
 - Consider the need for Pandemic Plan inclusion.

**Visiting Committee
Northeast Arkansas Education Cooperative
211 West Hickory
Walnut Ridge, AR 72476**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member	Dr. Charles Watson, Program Manager Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Ms. Kerry Reddick Art Teacher Marmaduke High School
Administrator	Ms. Sherry Moody Curriculum Coordinator Valley View School District
College/University Representative	Ms. Sue Whitmire, Interim Chair Department of Education Williams Baptist College
Cooperative Employee	Ms. Shirley Hooks, Assistant Director Wilbur Mills Education Service Cooperative
School Board Member	Ms. Patty Camp Paragould School Board
Business/Industry Representative	Mr. Ernest "Junior" Briner Vice President of Support Services Lawrence Health Services
Parents	Mr. Terry Kelly Ms. Robin Roby

Evaluation Summary
Northwest Arkansas Education Service Cooperative
Wednesday, May 23, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Northwest Arkansas Education Service Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

The Northwest Arkansas Education Service Cooperative was approved by the State Board of Education to begin operation on July 1, 1985. Since that time the cooperative has operated continuously serving 100% of the school districts (including charter schools) in the three-county area. The Cooperative is governed by a board of directors composed of superintendents of the member school districts. The Board meets at least eight (8) times annually.

The primary services of the Cooperative are aligned with the overall needs as determined by the Board of Directors and the elected Teacher Center Committee. The following are the current adopted objectives:

- Assist schools/districts in meeting accreditation standards and equalizing educational opportunities for students throughout the service area
- Assist schools/districts in using educational resource more effectively through cooperation among districts
- Promote coordination between school districts and the Department of Education to provide services which are consistent with the needs identified by the districts.

During the evaluation visit, this sub-committee reviewed historical documents, minutes of meetings of the Board of Directors, various financial documents, needs assessment reports and interviewed the director. It is the consensus on this sub-committee that the governance of the Cooperative meets or exceeds all the statutory requirements.

Recommendations:

- The Cooperative should engage in an audit of the technology available for use by staff and for doing business, including providing professional development via distance learning. Once the audit is complete, prepare a plan to upgrade necessary equipment and software especially in support for providing professional development.
- The Committee supports the recommendations from the self study, most of which will be repeated in the program section of the report.

Program

This sub-committee reviewed the self-study report, interviewed cooperative staff, and visited with Teacher Center Committee representatives and agrees that the overall program area of work meets or exceeds the legislative intent and outlined in statute. The Committee notes that an annual assessment is conducted to determine areas of need for the coming year(s). Each summer and throughout the school year, the Cooperative provides professional development events for teachers, administrators as well as many services directly to students and their families.

The Committee notes that through the Cooperative all districts receive valuable services; however, in smaller districts teachers and administrators would not receive many of the opportunities if the Cooperative were not present.

Recommendations:

The committee supports the recommendations found in the self-study document and highlights the following in addition.

- Explore options that would allow services of the Mathematics and Science Center currently housed at the University of Arkansas to be more attentive to the needs of teachers and to provide more opportunities for teachers through the Cooperative. One option would be to pursue relocation of that center into the Cooperative.
- Upgrade technology hardware and software to better meet the instructional needs of administrators and teachers in the region.
- As technology in the schools improves, consider providing more training via distance learning and/or consider moving some of the training currently planned for the Cooperative site into the local schools. Perhaps such a relocation of providing services might reduce travel costs and travel time for participants.
- Although listed in the self-study, the committee wishes to highlight the need for and support for completing the work in progress on K-12 instructional alignment and to extend that work to other content disciplines. Additionally, explore options for training teachers to use the instructional alignment documents while minimizing teachers being away from classrooms during the school year.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This sub-committee reviewed the legislative requirements and examined the self-study report, annual financial reports, and fiscal audits as well as interviewed the Cooperative director and the bookkeeper. The sub-committee finds that in all areas reviewed, fiscal management and personnel functions meet or exceed the legislative mandates.

Concerning personnel, the sub-committee reviewed licensing credentials of the program staff and found that all met the requirements for Highly Qualified Teachers, as outlined in the No Child Left Behind legislation. The committee noted this as a major plus although such reporting is not required by the state.

The sub-committee also comments on the overall funding of the cooperative in that less than 10% of the revenue is from state funds, the balance being awarded primarily from grants. Such funding allows staff to extend services, but often that same staff must be working on grant development, reporting or evaluation rather than providing direct services to participants from the member schools and districts.

Recommendations:

- Consider employment of a part-time grant writer/developer. This would free some staff of the rigor of continually working on grant development and allow more time for service activities for teachers and administrators in the member schools and districts.
- Explore the options of establishing an Educational Foundation that could become a resource for additional funding or for options of receiving tax-deferred gifts and donations.
- Continue to advocate for per-pupil allocation of state funds. Currently, each cooperative shares equally in the allocation and distribution of state funds. Such distribution is not equitable given the difference in the number of teachers and schools to be served by the cooperatives.

**Visiting Committee
Northwest Arkansas Education Service Cooperative
4 North Double Springs Road
Farmington, AR 72730**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Brad Ball Northridge Middle School Van Buren School District
Administrator	Dr. Frank Holman Superintendent Cabot School District
College/University Representative	Cecil Boothe Director Harding University
Cooperative Employee	Dr. Gary Standridge University of Arkansas
School Board Member	Dr. Randy Barrett Superintendent Gentry School District
Business/Industry Representative	Paula Ditmars Arvest Bank
Parents	Vanessa Sbanotto Michelle Beeks

Evaluation Summary
Ozarks Unlimited Resources (OUR) Educational Cooperative
Friday, April 13, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from OUR Educational Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

It is noted that the facilities from which the services are provided lack in space, accessibility, storage and secure permanent housing for documents needed for long-term historical perspective. The Director reported that work is underway to construct a new facility that will be specifically designed to meet many if not most of the documented space needs. The Committee supports this move and encourages the staff and the Board to actively pursue the necessary funding and financial structure to make this proposed new location a reality.

Historical Perspective and Governance

The Historical Perspective and Governance sub-committee reviewed legislative requirements, board policies, board meeting minutes, needs assessments, surveys, and historical records. Based on these reviews and interviews with staff and members of the Executive Board, the cooperative is in compliance with legislative requirements relative to these areas of review.

In 1985, the OUR Cooperative met the requirements for organization and governance in accordance with ACT 349. The Cooperative is governed by the superintendents of the 16 school districts served. Policies for the operation and management of the Cooperative have been developed and are consistent with state requirements. Annual budgets and financial reports are submitted in accordance with the APSCN system. The Cooperative meets requirements for frequency of board meetings and Teacher Center Committee meetings.

Recommendations:

The Committee concurs with the following recommendations found in the self-study document.

- The Director should continue the current effort to update the board policies in order to be able to recommend a more complete operations manual to the board.
- The staff is encouraged to devise a system for better historical record keeping and retrieval of anecdotal data pertaining to the Cooperative.

Additional Recommendations from the Committee:

- When the new Cooperative facility is constructed, consideration should be given to providing fire protection for essential records and data.

- The Cooperative is encouraged to pursue a system for duplicating and storing back-up records at a separate location.

Program

This sub-committee examined numerous documents including minutes of the Teacher Center Committee and the Gifted and Talented Coordinators' Meetings, needs assessment surveys, evaluation instruments for the professional development sessions provided by cooperative staff, the Cooperative Annual Report and other materials made available to the Committee during the visit. Also, the Committee interviewed cooperative staff and members of the Teacher Center Committee. These materials reviews and interviews provided ample evidence that the OUR cooperative is in compliance with the state mandates and is providing essential services to member schools.

The Committee supports the recommendations as listed in the self-study materials. Of particular note are the recommendations to enhance professional development opportunities by focusing on specialized departments and by providing follow-up opportunities in a wide variety of content areas and to improve communication channels within the staff and to the member schools.

Other recommendations:

- Send e-mails concerning professional development directly to all staff in member schools.
- Update and catalog the media resource library – weeding the collection is a critical component of this work.
- Extend the CIV services to encompass mathematics and science professional development opportunities that originate at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville.
- Partner more with the North Arkansas College to extend professional development opportunities.
- Consider establishing an advisory group comprised of community members and parents.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

The Committee commends the OUR staff for its attention to financial management issues that were experienced in previous years. In three years this

staff has taken the budget from a huge deficit to a current position clear of debt and with a healthy carryover that includes a substantial building fund amount.

After interviewing the Director, the Committee notes that much work has gone into research and planning for the upcoming building project. The need for new facilities is clear from a quick tour of the present building and office space. Parking is inadequate and not easily accessible to meeting rooms and service to handicapped individuals is all but precluded in the current building arrangement.

It is apparent that the staff and Director are committed to improving professional development and providing quality service to teachers, administrators, parents and students from this area of the state. The current hiring practice shows a priority in quality teamwork and personal investment. An example is that the Director has invested much time and effort in finding the "right people" who are qualified for the position and will help advance the progress made toward regaining the faith and trust of those served by the Cooperative. During an interview with local superintendents and school personnel, the Committee realized that the trust and faith that had been lost is now being restored and that staff is a key element for a healthy atmosphere between teachers, administrators and Cooperative staff.

The Committee endorses the recommendations set forth in the self-study.

Suggestions for Community Involvement

Members from the Committee noted that the Harrison area and this region of north Arkansas is very "giving." One area that could be explored is a community pledge drive. Increased awareness in the community of the OUR needs regarding the building project and funding such as new computer equipment is essential. An example of possible community support could involve the seven local banks pledging funds or an endowment for a specific area of need. In return, the Cooperative could provide facilities for training of employees or providing staff to assist with such local community meeting needs.

**Visiting Committee
Ozarks Unlimited Resource Cooperative
525 Old Bellefonte Road
Harrison, AR 72601**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member	Dr. Charles Watson, Program Manager Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Ms. Mary Wince Bruno-Pyatt School District
Administrator	Mr. Dennis Copeland, Principal Cotter High School, Cotter School District
College/University Representative	Ms. Wilma Finney, Staff Member North Arkansas College
Cooperative Employee	Mr. Harrell Austin, Director Northeast Arkansas Education Cooperative
School Board Member	Mr. David White Bergman School District
Business/Industry Representative	Ms. Carolyn Arnold, Staff Member Community First Bank
Parents	Mr. Steve Powers Ms. Monica Harner

Evaluation Summary
South Central Service Cooperative
Wednesday, April 18, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from the South Central Service Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

The sub-committee reviewed exhibits provided to the committee including the original request to establish a cooperative, board minutes, needs assessment documents, participation data, and financial data. Presently the cooperative serves 13 districts with approximately 17,600 students, which is below that required in the legislation (20,000) for a minimum area of service. The number of students has decreased significantly during the past 10 years due to relocation of major employers and overall population decrease in the Arkansas delta. The sub-committee notes that the cooperative actively maintains partnerships with two major universities, Henderson State University and Southern Arkansas University, and area Enterprise Renewal Zones recently formed in the region.

The sub-committee supports the documentation provided in the self-study and believe that all requirements established in legislation are being met with the exception of number of students served.

The sub-committee has no recommendation regarding the issue of meeting the minimum number of students to be served as found in the legislation.

Program

This sub-committee's work included a review of self-study documents, needs assessment studies, program evaluations for the past years, interviews with teacher center committee members and participants in professional development offerings. Those interviewed strongly supported the work of cooperative staff in helping the schools meet the instructional needs of students enrolled in the schools being served as well as direct services to pre-school children and their parents.

The staff conducts a needs assessment each year and constructs programming to meet the documented needs of teachers and administrators. Each year a wide variety of workshops, seminars and trainings are provided. Electronic delivery of professional development allows staff to minimize travel to some extent while providing a wider variety of experiences to participants.

The sub-committee observed that services are provided in a dated, well-used facility that previously was used as a school building. Thus, conference space, staff work space and participant parking are lacking.

The sub-committee notes the successful work of staff in writing and securing grants that help extend the options for programming across the region and across the many areas of service.

Recommendations:

- Examine all possibilities for acquiring a new or newer facility to house the cooperative, especially the professional development components of the program.
- If a new facility is not available in the very near future, seek alternate locations for housing professional development activities. Such options could include local school facilities throughout the cooperative service territory, facilities at college and university campuses, and/or more distance learning options.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This sub-committee reviewed the budget and other financial records provided and affirm that this area meets or exceeds established standards and legal requirements for fiscal management. The sub-committee notes that the cooperative is sound financially and adheres to established accounting and budgeting practices. The income is a combination of state funding, which accounts for less than 10% of the overall funds with the remainder of funds from partnership agreements with local districts or from state and/or federal grants. The sub-committee recognizes the amount of time that the staff spends each year preparing grant proposals and providing documentation of operation and management of the grant programs.

The sub-committee commends the cooperative management for seeking and employing a highly qualified staff many with years of experience with the cooperative.

The sub-committee found personnel management consistent with established standards. Personnel documents such as policy handbooks, etc., were reviewed and found to reflect clear statements of expectation on the part of the employee and the employer. It was noted that some staff vacancies are not filled in a timely manner. Some positions have been vacant for many months.

Recommendations:

- Actively pursue alternate facilities to house the staff and professional development programs offered through the cooperative. The present

facility is very dated, has minimal storage, almost no parking for participants, and seems to be a financial drain due to maintenance.

- Become more aggressive in advertising and filling staff vacancies. It is critical to get the "right" person for the job, but some programs seem to be suffering from lack of staff to complete the work that should be on-going.

**Visiting Committee
South Central Service Cooperative
400 Maul Road
Camden, AR 71701**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Ms. Judy Trowell Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Ron Goddard Waldron High School Waldron School District
Administrator	Hyacinth Deon Superintendent Prescott School District
College/University Representative	Dr. Randall Adams, Professor Southern Arkansas University
Cooperative Employee	David Henderson Southwest Arkansas Ed Service Cooperative
School Board Member	Lawrence Bearden Board President Smackover School District
Business/Industry Representative	Steve Keith, President Farmers Bank and Trust
Parents	Amy Reynolds Janice Warwick

Evaluation Summary
Southeast Arkansas Education Service Cooperative
Friday, March 23, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Southeast Arkansas Education Service Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

Based on the self-study of the Southeast Arkansas Education Service Cooperative and interviews with staff and administration, the Historical Perspective and Governance Committee found that all required components under review meet or exceed legislative requirement with one exception. That section is referenced by §6-13-1005, Part 3 requiring regional service cooperatives to serve schools having a collective population of 20,000 students in grades K-12. Because of population declines in the Delta region of Arkansas, currently this cooperative has a K-12 student population of 17,290.

This sub-committee believes that Southeast Arkansas Education Service Cooperative is doing a quality job of providing a wide variety of specific services to a school population that is declining in southeast Arkansas. The committee notes that this area of the state is economically depressed and has a declining workforce and a school population that include high percentages of students who qualify for free or reduced price meals. This subcommittee believes that the Cooperative is bringing resources to its member schools, which would probably not be available without the assistance from the Cooperative.

Southeast Arkansas Education Service Cooperative uses its limited resources to support students and teachers and has assumed increasingly more of the administrative functions for its member since its formation in 1981.

All member schools are within approximately fifty miles of the Cooperative site, which is located in Monticello.

This sub-committee also reviewed the governance structure of Southeast Arkansas Education Service Cooperative. Our findings are that the administrative structure meets the requirements of §6-13-1006. The self-study documents and exhibits provide evidence to support the governance requirements.

Recommendations

It is this committee's recommendation that although the number of students enrolled in schools served by the cooperative is less than the expected 20,000, that it does not pose an organizational problem and at this point realignment of the geographic regions should not be considered. Any geographical reorganization could cause the newly annex areas to be outside the fifty mile or one hour driving time to attend cooperative functions and/or could erode services provided by other regional service cooperatives.

Program

Programming provided by Southeast Arkansas Education Service Cooperative meets or exceeds all state program requirements as required in statutes. It is noted that the cooperative receives a base funding which is less than 10% of the full budget, which implies that most of the program funds to support activities and initiatives of the cooperative are supported almost totally by grant funding or support contributed by member school districts.

Programs are provided based on needs assessments conducted by the cooperative staff that involve administrators and teachers from all member districts in the service territory. Innovative programming such as Americorp Teacher Initiative, Early College High School and Target Testing are positively affecting schools statewide. Original programs that were pioneered by Southeast Arkansas Education Service Cooperative and duplicated across the state include math coaches training, science coaches training and job-alike meetings. The Cooperative promotes Department of Education initiatives from content area programs to administrative initiatives.

Recommendations:

- Explore options for providing additional revenue to support the technology initiatives – both programming and staffing
- Continue to explore ways to support (fund) and expand formative assessments and to network with other cooperatives to share this work statewide
- Consider some type of formal program evaluation of the distance-learning program to determine the performance level of students who enroll in courses taught through the distance-learning program. Expand the distance-learning options as the continuing needs assessment conveys the need.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

The Southeast Arkansas Education Service Cooperative is a valuable asset to the education system in southeast Arkansas. This committee affirms that the services provided are creative and cost effective and without the cooperative such services would be non-existent for the schools in this region of the state.

This committee reviewed the self-study documents, the financial statements, audit reports and other documents and exhibits provided and conclude that

financial documentation meets or exceeds expected performance as outlined in the statutes. The cooperative administration and staff are very resourceful in efforts to obtain grants to extend the base appropriation for services provided. It is noted that the administration and staff have been most successful in grant procurement processes. Without the success in this area, many – if not most – of the services provided would not exist.

Personnel policies and job descriptions are well written, updated and functional. Salary schedules for all positions are in place and implemented. Personnel are evaluated based on performance evaluation descriptions, which have been developed from a variety of resources including local district performance evaluation procedures.

This committee commends the administrative leadership of this cooperative and attributes much of the success in all areas of service to dedicated administration and capable and hardworking staff members.

Recommendation:

- The Committee strongly supports work underway to increase base funding from the State so that services and on-going expenses can be maintained if not expanded to meet the documented needs of schools and participants in the region.

Visiting Committee
Southeast Arkansas Education Service Cooperative
Post Office Box 2837
West Helena, AR 72390

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Patty Osbourne Stuttgart Elementary School Stuttgart School District
Administrator	Max Dyson Superintendent Hampton School District
College/University Representative	James Daniels Staff Member College
Cooperative Employee	Marsha Daniels, Director South Central Service Cooperative
School Board Member	Lee Busby Monticello School District
Business/Industry Representative	Beverly Hudson
Parents	Kristi Satterlee Rena McCone

Evaluation Summary
Southwest Arkansas Educational Cooperative
Friday, April 20, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Southwest Arkansas Educational Service Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

The visiting committee was informed of the potential for collaboration with the local community college and the city of Hope to be part of a new facility under consideration at the local community college site. If this were to materialize, the committee supports the need for alternate facilities. The current building is an old elementary school that has served as the site since the Cooperative's inception. The visiting committee strongly endorses the need for alternate facilities to support the many programs and professional development offerings scheduled weekly.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

This sub-committee reviewed documents detailing the history, governance and administrative structure of the Southwest Arkansas Educational Cooperative. The committee reviewed organizational documents, minutes of Board meetings and other documents as well as conducted interviews with the Cooperative Director and bookkeeper and thus affirms that these areas meet or exceed in many ways the statutory guidance as established by the Arkansas General Assembly. The Cooperative is well managed and appears to be supported by its participating districts through participation on the Board and by attendance at functions. The Cooperative demonstrates good stewardship in utilizing the funds appropriated. The Committee notes that often governance of entities with such a large portion of the income from grant funds is difficult, but none of those potential issues seems to be present for this organization. Continued management of programming in many areas will be dependent on future grants, which has become a way of life.

Program

This sub-committee reviewed self-study materials, participation logs, summaries of assessments and interviewed staff and local district participants and supports the finding that the programs provided exceeds the statutory requirements set forth by legislation. Documentation provided supports the tenet that programming is offered to support identified needs from participant surveys. Local district staff members perceive the variety of programming and the dedication of staff to meet instructional needs to be major strengths of the management and operation of the Cooperative. It is apparent that student achievement is a focus for professional development.

A strength of services offered lies in the area of instructional technology. Since a large number of the local districts do not have a technology coordinator, the Cooperative provides services to schools on a regular basis. Smaller districts in the region become a first priority for service.

The sub-committee noted the wide variety of programming available to teachers, administrators, parents of pre-school children as well as direct services to a cadre of pre-school children who are identified as having developmental needs. The staff has a positive working relationship with higher education institutions in the area.

Recommendations:

- As high school reform becomes more prevalent, it is necessary to continue and expand opportunities for secondary-level teachers to participate in high-quality, specific content area professional development. The initial focus should be in areas for which there are state assessments – literacy, mathematics and science.

- Seek funding through grant opportunities to provide a state of the art technology lab and updated equipment to serve as a model for all school districts and the community.
- Utilize distance learning to provide additional opportunities for professional development at the individual school sites. Presenters could originate at the Cooperative site and viewed at each of the school sites throughout the region. Such delivery would decrease travel time for participants and perhaps open up new opportunities for scheduling.
- Provide more opportunities for job-alike groups to network and learn from others with similar positions.

This committee also endorses the following recommendations from the self-study.

- Provide a state-of-the art technology center at the Cooperative to serve as a model for schools and provide the latest technology training for teachers.
- Provide a Mathematics/Science Center at the Cooperative for more accessible use by the districts.
- Seek funding for a high school level coordinators in mathematics, science and social studies.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This sub-committee reviewed many documents relating to the fiscal management and personnel management of the cooperative, which included Board minutes, personnel policy handbooks, state audit reports, and inventories and finds that this area of the study meets and generally exceeds requirements as provided in statutes. Interviews with the director and bookkeeper support the transparent system for recordkeeping that is in place.

**Visiting Committee
Southwest Arkansas Education Service Cooperative
500 South Spruce
Hope, Arkansas 71801**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	David Schwope Bearden High School Bearden School District
Administrator	Judy Dowdy Assistant Superintendent Ashdown School District
College/University Representative	Dr. Lowell Gadbury Staff Member University
Cooperative Employee	Kathy Heagwood, Assistant Director DeQueen/Mena Education Cooperative
School Board Member	Russell Womack Spring Hill School District
Business/Industry Representative	Wesley Woodard County Economic Development Office
Parents	Rev. Alvin Hunter Mary Godwin

Evaluation Summary
Western Arkansas Education Service Cooperative
Tuesday, May22, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Western Arkansas Educational Service Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

The Western Arkansas Education Service Cooperative was organized in 1984 and was one of the original fifteen (15) cooperatives established following enabling legislation by the Arkansas General Assembly. Since its inception, the Western Arkansas Education Service Cooperative has served 100% of the districts in the service area. Originally, there were 25 member districts and now the number has been reduced to 21 districts. The reduction is due to consolidation and reconfiguration of smaller districts in the service territory. This cooperative established policy to address needs of local districts and the teachers and administrators who work in those districts. The focus of the work of the cooperative has remained constant over the years, but the detail and programming shifts with the most current needs assessment, which is conducted annually.

The cooperative has a governing board made up of the superintendent or the superintendent's designee. The Board meets on a monthly basis and utilizes the services of an executive committee to tend to fiduciary duties, as need demands. Officers are duly elected and serve specific terms.

Over the years the cooperative has expanded facilities to accommodate the increasing services and new staff employed to meet the needs of students in the region.

This sub-committee observes that the governance structure and administration meet and exceeds the requirements as outlined in the enabling legislation. The committee also notes that the many services provided and resources available to schools in the region are well known to those who use the services, but the broader community probably has limited if any understanding of the work of this and other cooperatives across the state.

Recommendations (Some of the following recommendations relate as well to the program component)

- Give careful consideration to developing strategies that will help communicate the work of the cooperative to local community members and community leaders.
- Explore the options created by technology to enhance and/or extend the professional development provided by cooperative staff.

Program

The program initiatives of Western Arkansas Education Service Cooperative are determined primarily by annual needs assessment surveys. Programming provides a broad array of professional development for teacher, administrators, aids and other school personnel throughout the school year with a major concentration offered during the summer months. The staff plans an array of program offerings, which are delivered by staff and by contracted presenters. Many of the initiatives are in keeping with work supported by the Arkansas Department of Education with Smart Start, Smart Step, Reading First and other similar initiatives.

The sub-committee interviewed cooperative staff, local district administrators and teacher center advisory committee members and all affirmed that the cooperative is very sensitive to local district needs and when necessary find or secure resources and materials to meet those identified needs. It was also noted that facilities and resources have expanded to meet the needs of students. Just this year a new facility was opened to provide additional staff office space, storage and meeting facilities, which have temporarily relieved some crowded workspace for the staff.

Needs have been identified in the content areas of mathematics and science with a focus at the secondary level. It was noted that an additional staff member was being employed to address the needs in science. Concern was expressed among the staff related to securing services from regional math and science specialists funded by the Department of Education.

There is a strong partnership with the University of Arkansas at Fort Smith for providing technical courses and some general education courses for high school students. The intent of this program is to provide high school students an opportunity to earn some college credits while still in high school with the hope of encouraging those students to continue a course of study after high school graduation.

It is noted that a very large portion of the programming is supported by grants from the Department of Education and/or other sources. To that extent considerable staff time is required to tend to grant writing and grant administration duties. This work reduces the time that staff members have to work specifically with area schools. However, it is noted without such funding programming would be severely limited.

This committee affirms that the programs offered meet and most often exceed expectations and requirements of the statutes.

Recommendations:

- Expand the high school opportunities to include content specialists for math, literacy and science. Continue to explore the availability of staff newly created in science by the State Department of Education and determine how these staff can help provide content expertise for regional teachers. Perhaps one way to do this would be to provide office space for these individuals at the cooperative and seek to have them assigned at least part time at this site.
- Provide additional professional development options for "job-alike" groups to work together and receive specifically designed training for those content areas.
- Continue to purchase additional technology that will allow the delivery of more professional development via distance learning. As more equipment becomes available in individual schools, more presentations originating from the cooperative might minimize teacher travel time to attend professional development sessions.
- Continue to explore options for distance learning for high school students in the area. Many of the other cooperatives initiate high school courses, many offered for college credit, which would be available to students in the area.
- Seriously evaluate the continuing value of the VHS delivery to schools with the idea of replacing that resource with a more current technology.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This sub-committee reviewed many documents related to financial management and reporting. Following interviews with the bookkeeping staff, the committee reports that this component of the cooperative's management is well organized, seemingly efficient, and meets or exceeds state reporting and auditing requirements. Conversations with area superintendents confirm that regular financial reports are provided to the Board and Executive Committee in a timely manner.

The sub-committee observed that this staff does a commendable job in identifying and securing grant funding to supplement the minimal state appropriation for management and operation of the cooperatives.

Personnel documents were reviewed and are reflective of current employment and personnel practices. The committee notes the outstanding qualifications of

the staff for the positions held. Many of the staff members have been employed with the cooperative for many years, some since its inception.

The committee affirms that the fiscal records and personnel policies are in keeping with accepted practices and are in excellent form. This area of the study meets or exceeds legislative standards.

Recommendations:

- Consider assimilating a committee to review and update the personnel handbook. It appears that it has been at least two years since this document was last reviewed.
- Explore a way to showcase the qualifications of staff employed by the cooperative. One way would be to identify programming and the qualifications of staff providing services.

**Visiting Committee
Western Arkansas Education Cooperative
3010 East Highway 22, Suite A
Branch, Arkansas 72928**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Anita Cooper Oark School District Oark High School
Administrator	Dr. Barbara Wood, Superintendent McGehee School District
College/University Representative	Dr. Gary Standridge University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
Cooperative Employee	Carolyn Doyle, Teacher Center Coordinator Arch Ford Education Service Cooperative
School Board Member	Kris Schaffer, Member Charleston School District
Business/Industry Representative	Paul David Gramlich Charleston Express
Parents	Carrie Couthren Linda Abbott

Evaluation Summary
Wilbur D. Mills Education Service Cooperative
Wednesday, March 7, 2007

Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-13-1021 requires that each five years the regional education service cooperatives engage in an evaluation study and review to be coordinated by the Arkansas Department of Education. This summary describes the process, identifies the on-site evaluation team, and presents findings and recommendations that resulted from the site visit.

Evaluation Process

In keeping with Arkansas Code, staff from Wilbur D. Mills Education Service Cooperative conducted a self-study and reported status of the use satisfaction, service adequacy, financial support, staff qualifications, and performance and administrative effectiveness. This self-study document was provided to the evaluation team along with baseline data as collected periodically by the cooperative staff.

The Department of Education, in consultation with the cooperative director, invited a team to visit the cooperative site and conduct a review of the documents. A list of committee members is attached to this report.

The agenda for the evaluation site visit included an overview presentation prepared by the cooperative staff, which highlighted the various areas of service provided to districts/schools served and direct services to administrators and teachers as well as services to eligible children as identified for special services. Team members were assigned to a sub-committee and given the task of reviewing the self-study documents and exhibits including data from questionnaires and participant surveys as well as conducting brief interviews with staff. Team members also had the opportunity to visit with administrators and teacher committee representatives to survey user satisfaction with services provided.

Finally, team members were asked to prepare a summary statement and make any recommendations that would enhance the work of the cooperative in meeting the education needs of those served.

Team Summaries

Historical Perspective and Governance

The Wilbur D. Mills Education Service Cooperative as established in 1985 is structured in accordance with Act 349. The Cooperative is named to honor the late Wilbur D. Mills an influential member of the United States House of Representatives from Arkansas. The Cooperative is governed by a board of directors, each member representing a local school district served by the Cooperative and appointed by that local board of directors. The Cooperative Board meets ten (10) times annually.

The Cooperative owns three buildings in downtown Beebe, which house the offices and conference facilities for the Cooperative staff.

The Cooperative has an exemplary working relationship with the higher education institutions located in the service region – Harding University and Arkansas State University at Beebe. These collaborative agreements support shared services and facilities to provide professional development for teachers and administrators throughout the service region.

Recommendations:

- Study the salary schedule and seek funding to establish a more competitive salary schedule. (The staff has experienced greater than usual vacancies due to local districts or the Department of Education paying higher salaries.)
- Continue to expand the number and size of meeting rooms to accommodate the increased demand for professional development.

Program

This sub-committee finds that the Wilbur D. Mills Education Service Cooperative Program component meets or exceeds the legislative intent as outlined in statutes and objectives set for programming by the Cooperative Board of Directors.

The Committee found that the ten plus major programs (literacy, mathematics, early childhood, career and technical, early childhood special education, gifted/talented, special education supervision, professional development, and technology, etc.) serve a wide range of needs as established by the schools, teachers, administrators, parents, and students served. The Committee noted that participants found services to be of high quality, directed to meeting needs

and sufficient to meet the needs and interest of users of those services. The Committee specifically notes the variety and quality of professional development services provided and the collegial nature of work with higher education partners in the region. Specifically, during the summer 2006, the Cooperative provided 236 professional development workshops without cost to 15,250 participants who were seeking to meet the requirements for professional development as outlined by the Arkansas Department of Education.

The existing facilities are functional and serve the region well; however, there is a documented need for additional classroom space to provide distance learning and additional professional development sessions. For many years sessions have been conducted at Harding University during the summers. Due to expanded programs at Harding, those facilities are more difficult to schedule, thus the Cooperative will have to provide alternate sites for many sessions. Currently the regional mathematics and science service center on the Harding Campus provides a variety of services that will need to be expanded in coming years due to the increased Benchmark testing in science.

This Committee notes that State funding for cooperative services has not increased in several years. This means that programs and extended services must be provided through grants or pooled resources from the local districts.

Recommendations:

- Continue to explore options for additional space for professional development and distance learning sessions.
- Work with the other regional cooperatives to seek expanded state resources, thus minimizing the always-urgent need to write and submit grants for funds to provide services.
- Continue to support the collaboration with higher education institutions and to utilize services and resources of the University to meet professional development needs of teachers and administrators.

Fiscal Management, Budget and Personnel

This sub-committee reviewed the fiscal and personnel requirements as stated in statute and the self-study documents as prepared by staff in preparation for the evaluation and visit also interviews with the director, bookkeeper and other management team members. This Committee notes that the Cooperative has a highly qualified staff with a working board of directors. The professional staff is recognized as leaders in their areas across the state and some regionally.

Following the Committee's review of documents provided, interviews with staff, and a review of fiscal records including State audit reports, the Committee finds that the fiscal management and personnel management of the Wilbur D. Mills Education Service Cooperative meets or exceeds all statutory requirements for this area of study.

Recommendation:

- The Committee strongly supports work underway to increase base funding from the State so that services and on-going expenses can be maintained if not expanded to meet the documented needs of schools and participants in the region.
- Maintain continual evaluation of services provided so as to maximize work to meet documented needs and to discontinue, when necessary, areas of work that are not longer being utilized or are not specifically directed to meeting the needs of students.

**Visiting Committee
Wilbur Mills Education Service Cooperative
Post Office Box 850
Beebe, AR 72012**

Position	Representative
ADE Staff Member Committee Chairman	Dr. Charles Watson Arkansas Department of Education
Teacher	Sheri Smith, Counselor Rogers School District
Administrator	Dr. Ted Hall, Superintendent Batesville School District
College/University Representative	Dr. Tony Finley Education Department Harding University
Cooperative Employee	Suzann McCommon, Director Great Rivers Education Service Cooperative
School Board Member	Linda Benson Searcy School District
Business/Industry Representative	Jim Wooten, President TigerMart, Inc., Beebe
Parents	Kathy Moss Jackie Skyrme



LITTLE ROCK SCHOOL DISTRICT

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

August 30, 2007

RECEIVED
COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE

AUG 31 2007

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

T. Kenneth James, Ed.D.
Commissioner of Education
#4 State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201

Dear Dr. James,

As you are aware, Senator Irma Hunter Brown and Representative Wilhelmina Lewellen of Little Rock sponsored Act 917 of 2007 of the 86th General Assembly to appropriate funds to encourage statewide student participation in the 50th Central High School Anniversary. We are excited that all students in the state of Arkansas will have an opportunity to participate in the Little Rock Central High 1957-2007 Commemoration through involvement in statewide literacy and art activities.

With the nation's eyes focused once again on Little Rock Central High School, there will be significant media coverage of the dedication of the Central High School Visitors' Center on September 24th and the commemoration ceremonies on the campus of Central High School on September 25th. Over 5,000 visitors are ticketed to attend the September 25th ceremony, and with the Secret Service involvement in the planning, we expect that President Bush and former President Clinton will likely be in attendance.

Based on the recommendations of the principal, the citywide planning committee, and the advance security teams who have been involved in planning for this historic event, we made the decision several months ago to close Central High School to students on September 24th and 25th, 2007. This letter is respectfully submitted as a request for your consideration of a waiver of student attendance at Central High School on these two days. Without benefit of the waiver, students would be required to attend school an additional two days after other LRSD schools are dismissed for the year.

Students at Central High School will certainly be participating in the statewide contests as specified in Act 917 of 2007, but will also be exposed to opportunities over the next several months to become more intensively active in educational activities and events with historical emphasis on the significance of the 1957 – 2007 commemoration. In addition, every student at Central will be required to complete a graded assignment which is directly related to the 1957 crisis or the 2007 commemoration. We believe the two day waiver will serve as an incentive for students to participate in this additional opportunity to become a part of history.

Your consideration of this request for a waiver of two student attendance days at Central High School is respectfully requested.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "L. Watson".

Linda Watson, Ed.D.
Interim Superintendent of Schools

cc: Nancy Rousseau



LITTLE ROCK SCHOOL DISTRICT

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

RECEIVED
COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE

September 14, 2007

SEP 18 2007

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

T. Kenneth James, Ed.D.
Commissioner of Education
#4 State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201

Dear Dr. James,

As we discussed last week, the LRSD administration made the decision several months ago to close Central High School to students on September 24th and 25th, 2007, in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the integration of that school. We submitted a letter requesting your consideration of a waiver of student attendance at Central High on those two days. Without benefit of the waiver, students will be required to attend school an additional two days after other LRSD schools are dismissed for the year.

A special meeting of the Board of Directors of the LRSD was held on Thursday, September 13, 2007. At that meeting the board voted to support the administration's recommendation to seek a waiver from the Arkansas Department of Education for these two student attendance days at Central High School.

Your consideration of this request is respectfully requested.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "L. Watson".

Linda Watson, Ed.D.
Interim Superintendent of Schools

cc: Nancy Rousseau

**2007-2008 Arkansas Better Chance Program
Recommendations for Funding - Round #4**

New Requests:

ABC Name	Vendor No.	City	Program Type	Grant Type	Amount Requested in Round #4
Centers for Youth and Families	100049022	Little Rock	Classroom	Direct Services	39,225
Conway School District	100036871	Conway	Classroom	Direct Services	22,989
DeQueen School District	100056336	DeQueen	Classroom	Direct Services	41,545
Dermott Special School District	100036933	Dermott	Classroom	Direct Services	52,126
Fort Smith School District	100036769	Fort Smith	Classroom	Direct Services	74,366
Glen Rose School District	100037184	Glen Rose	Classroom	Direct Services	9,760
Helena-West Helena School District	100036606	Helena-West Helena	Classroom	Direct Services	56,895
Hope School District	100036799	Hope	Classroom	Direct Services	35,827
Jonesboro School District	100036789	Jonesboro	Classroom	Direct Services	38,365
Kiddie Kollege	100049464	Holly Grove	Classroom	Direct Services	48,287
Marion School District	100036646	Marion	Classroom	Direct Services	9,760
Nettleton School District	100036881	Jonesboro	Classroom	Direct Services	73,727
Ouachita Technical College	100066176	Malvern	Classroom	Direct Services	41,382
Paragould School District	100031666	Paragould	Classroom	Direct Services	56,553
SEACBEC	100116911	Warren	Classroom	Direct Services	73,729
TOTAL REQUESTED					\$674,536

Grant Agreement Cancelled:

ABC Name		City	Program Type	Grant Type	Amount Previously Approved
Pattillo School		DeWitt	Classroom	Direct Services	97,600

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RULES GOVERNING THE GUIDELINES, PROCEDURES, AND ENFORCEMENT
OF THE ARKANSAS PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE ACT

~~August 2003~~

1.00 PURPOSE

- 1.01 These rules shall be known as the Arkansas Department of Education Rules Governing the Guidelines, Procedures, and Enforcement of the Arkansas Public School Choice Act.

2.00 AUTHORITY

- 2.01 The Arkansas State Board of Education's authority for promulgating these rules is pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-11-105, § 6-15-429, ~~and § 6-18-206~~ and Act 552 of 2007.

3.00 DEFINITIONS

- 3.01 Student – for purposes of this rule means any person legally enrolled or entitled to be enrolled in a public school district in Arkansas.
- 3.02 Resident district - for purposes of this rule means the public school district where a student is considered to reside pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. § 6-18-202.
- 3.03 Non-resident district - for purposes of this rule means the public school district a student last made legal application to attend pursuant to the Arkansas Public School Choice Act for the current school year.
- 3.04 Application - for purposes of this rule means a request submitted to a non-resident district to transfer from a student's resident district to a non-resident district on the official form approved by the Arkansas Department of Education.
- 3.05 Board - for purposes of this rule means the Arkansas State Board of Education.
- 3.06 Department - for purposes of this rule means the Arkansas Department of Education.
- 3.07 Minority - for purposes of this rule minority includes the following racial groups: African American, Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native.
- 3.08 Majority - for purposes of this rule majority includes the following racial group: Caucasian.

4.00 PROCESS AND PROCEDURES FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT PARTICIPATION
IN PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAM

- 4.01 Each school district shall participate in public school choice consistent with this section.
- 4.02 Every school district must adopt a resolution setting forth specific standards for acceptance and rejection of applications.
 - 4.02.1 Such standards may include the capacity of a school program, class, grade level, or school building.
 - 4.02.2 School districts shall not be required to add teachers, staff, or classrooms or in any way exceed current requirements or standards established by existing law when considering whether to accept an application.
 - 4.02.3 A school district's standards shall include a statement that priority will be given to applications of siblings or step-siblings residing in the same residence or household of students already attending the district by choice where an application has been filed.
 - 4.02.4 A school district's standards for acceptance and rejection of applications shall not include a student's previous academic achievement, athletic or extracurricular ability, handicapping conditions, English proficiency level, or previous disciplinary proceedings except that an expulsion from another school district may be included as a standard.
- 4.03 A district shall make public announcements over the broadcast media and in print media at such times and in such manner so as to inform parents or guardians of students in adjoining districts of the availability of the program, the July 1 application deadline, and the requirements and procedure for nonresident students to participate in the program.

5.00 PROCESS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPLICATIONS FOR TRANSFER
PURSUANT TO THE PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAM

- 5.01 Any student may make application to enroll and attend a school in a district in which the student does not reside, subject to the restrictions and procedures contained in this rule and regulation and Arkansas law.
 - 5.01.1 Before a student may attend a school in a nonresident district, the student's parent or guardian must submit an application on the

form approved by and provided by the Department (see attached application) to the nonresident district.

5.01.2 The application to the nonresident district must be postmarked no later than July 1 of the year the student would begin the fall semester in the nonresident school district.

5.02 Any student attending a resident district classified as being in academic distress shall be eligible and entitled to apply to transfer to another geographically contiguous nonresident district not in academic distress during the time period a district is classified as being in academic distress subject to the restrictions allowed in 5.02.1 and 8.00.

5.02.1 Any student submitting an application under this section shall not be required to file the petition by the July 1 deadline, but shall meet all other requirements and conditions of this rule.

5.03 Within thirty (30) days of receipt of an application for public school choice transfer from a nonresident student, the nonresident district shall notify the parent or guardian and the resident district in writing (via first class United States mail) as to whether the nonresident district accepted or rejected the student's application.

5.03.1 If the application is rejected, the nonresident district must state in the notification letter the specific reasons for rejection.

5.03.2 If the application is accepted, the nonresident district shall state in the notification letter:

- a. An absolute deadline for the student to enroll in the district, or the acceptance notification is null; and
- b. Any instructions for the renewal procedures established by the district.

5.04 Any student who accepts a school choice transfer may return to his or her school district during the course of the school year.

5.04.1 If a transferred student returns to his or her resident district during the school year, the student's transfer is voided and the student shall reapply for any future transfer.

~~5.04~~5.05 Any student that submitted a valid application for transfer, which was denied a transfer by the nonresident district, may petition the Board to reconsider the application for transfer. The petitioning party shall set forth its arguments and evidence supporting the request for the Board's reconsideration of the application along with a copy of the nonresident district's notification of rejection letter.

~~5.04.1~~ 5.05.1 The petition for reconsideration before the Board shall be in writing and shall be postmarked (via certified first class United States mail, return receipt requested) no later than ten (10) days after the student or student's parents or guardian receives notice of rejection from the nonresident district. Any request for a hearing before the Board must be made in the petition for reconsideration.

~~5.04.2~~ 5.05.2 The petitioning party must mail or personally file their petition for reconsideration of the application to the nonresident district with the Office of the Director of the Department.

~~5.04.3~~ 5.05.3 The nonresident district may submit in writing additional information, evidence or arguments supporting its rejection of the student's application.

~~5.04.4~~ 5.05.4 The Board, at its sole discretion, may grant a public hearing on the petition for reconsideration or consider without a public hearing the petition, briefs and evidence submitted in writing before issuing its final decision on the petition for reconsideration of the application.

~~5.04.5~~ 5.05.5 The Board may require the nonresident district to reconsider its rejection of the student application by a date established by the Board before deciding whether to grant the petition for reconsideration of the application.

~~5.04.6~~ 5.05.6 The Board, at its discretion, shall have the authority to require any person associated with the student application (i.e. student, parent, guardian, etc.), the nonresident district or the resident district to appear in person or by pleading before the Board as a witness on the matter of a petition for reconsideration of an application.

6.00 TRANSPORTATION OF STUDENTS IN PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAM

6.01 Transportation of a student from the resident district to a nonresident district is the responsibility of the student or the student's parents or guardians.

6.01.1 When a student transfers under section 5.02, the cost of transportation of a student from the resident district to the nonresident district shall be the responsibility of the resident district.

- 6.02 The nonresident district may enter into a written agreement with the student, student's parents or guardians, or resident school district to provide transportation to or from any place in the resident district to the nonresident district, or both.
- 6.03 A nonresident district shall terminate transportation services to a student upon receipt of written notice (via certified first class United States mail, return receipt requested) from the Department to cease and desist transporting a student from the student's resident district.

7.00 NONRESIDENT DISTRICT'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- 7.01 The nonresident district shall accept all credits toward graduation of a student that were awarded by another district.
- 7.02 The nonresident district shall award a diploma to a nonresident student accepted for transfer under the Public School Choice Program if that student meets the nonresident district's graduation requirements.
- 7.03 The nonresident student accepted for transfer under the Public School Choice Program shall be counted as a part of the average daily membership of the nonresident district to which the student transferred.

8.00 PROVISIONS FOR AND LIMITATIONS ON PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE TRANSFERS

- 8.01 No student may transfer to a nonresident district where the percentage of enrollment for the student's race exceeds that percentage in the student's resident district, except as provided in 8.01.1 and 8.01.2.
 - 8.01.1 A transfer is permitted if (1) the transfer is between districts within the same county; and (2) if the transfer does not result in either district exceeding the acceptable range of variance for representation of minority/majority students. The acceptable range of variance is determined as provided in Section 8.02, or
 - 8.01.2 A transfer is permitted if each school district ~~within the county~~ affected by the transfer does not have a critical mass of minority percentages of more than ten percent (10%) of any single race and the transfer is between two school districts in the same county.
- 8.02 The Department shall each year compute the minority/majority racial percentage(s) of the public school population for each county from the October Annual School Report. School districts may vary in the under-representation or over-representation of minority/majority students by a maximum of twenty-five percent (25%) of the difference in

majority/minority percentages for the county as determined by the Department. For example, when the Department has calculated the county's racial balance for each student race category, each district is allowed an over-representation or under-representation of minority or majority students of a range of up to twenty-five (25%) of the county's racial balance.

- 8.03 No student transfer shall be permitted under the Public School Choice Program when such a transfer would conflict with a district's desegregation court order or a district's court-approved desegregation plan.

9.00 REPORTING AND MONITORING OBLIGATIONS

- 9.01 The Department shall monitor school districts for compliance with the Public School Choice law (Ark. Code Ann. § 6-18-206) and these rules.
- 9.02 Each school district shall provide to the Department, within thirty (30) working days of receipt of a written request from the Department, any information or reports the Department deems necessary for review and determination of the school district's compliance with the Public School Choice law and these rules.
- 9.03 All school districts shall report to the Equity Assistance Center of the Department on an annual basis the race, gender, and other pertinent information needed to properly monitor compliance with the provisions of this section.
- 9.04 The reports may be on those forms that are prescribed by the Department, or the data may be submitted electronically by the district using a format authorized by the Department.
- 9.05 The Department may withhold state aid from any school district that fails to file its report each year or fails to file any other information with a published deadline requested from school districts by the Equity Assistance Center, so long as thirty (30) calendar days are given between the request for the information and the published deadline, except when the request comes from a member or committee of the General Assembly.

10.00 DISPUTES

- 10.01 Any school district may petition the State Board of Education to resolve alleged disputes arising under subsections (b) – (f) of Ark. Code Ann. § 6-18-206.

- 10.02 Any school district seeking to petition the State Board of Education must submit with its petition proof of public notice of the district's intent to petition the State Board. The public notice shall be published at least once per week for two consecutive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in all the school districts impacted or involved in the alleged dispute.
- 10.03 The school district shall file its written petition with the Office of the Director of the Department at least thirty (30) working days prior to the State Board of Education meeting where the petition will be heard.
- 10.04 The school district shall provide proof in the petition that they have served (via certified first class United States mail, return receipt requested) a copy of their petition to the superintendent of all other school districts involved in the alleged dispute.
- 10.05 The petition shall set forth in writing the particular issues of dispute under the Public School Choice Program, the specific relief for which the petitioning party is requesting the Board to address, and shall list all school districts and other relevant parties in the dispute.
- 10.06 The petition shall set forth what efforts have been attempted by all relevant school boards and superintendents of the involved school districts to resolve the alleged dispute.
- 10.07 The petition shall state in writing whether the petitioning school district requests a hearing before the Board.
- 10.08 The Board, in its sole discretion, shall determine whether to grant a public hearing on a petition or to take action on the petition and pleadings submitted without granting a public hearing.
- 10.09 Any school district that is listed as a party in a petition to resolve a dispute shall file a written response with the Office of the Director of the Department. The written response shall be submitted for the Board's consideration along with the petition within ten (10) working days of receipt of notice of the petition.
- 10.10 The Board shall issue a written decision regarding all issues of alleged dispute mentioned in the petition, and the written decision shall be served on all the school districts listed as parties of dispute in the petition (via certified first class United States mail, return receipt requested) within twenty (20) working days of the Board's final decision.
- 10.11 Except for the procedures specifically set forth in Ark. Code Ann. § 6-18-206 and these rules, all hearings conducted by the Board shall be

conducted pursuant to the Arkansas Administrative Procedures Act, Ark.
Code Ann. § 25-15-201 et. seq..

**Arkansas Department of Education
Proposed Rules Governing Reimbursement by
School Districts for Election Expenses**

1.00 Regulatory Authority

These rules are promulgated pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-11-105, 6-14-118, and Act 1200 of the 2007 regular session.

2.00 Purpose

This rule shall apply to all school districts and establishes the procedures to be used to determine the reimbursement amount that districts shall pay to the county to assist with the cost of school elections.

3.00 Procedures

3.01 This rule shall apply to all annual and special school elections.

3.02 Beginning with the 2007-2008 school year and each year thereafter, school districts in the county shall reimburse the county for the entire cost of the school election.

3.03 Each district's share of the total cost of the school election shall be determined by multiplying the total cost of the election by a fraction, the numerator of which is the number of votes cast in the specific school election and the denominator of which is the total number of votes cast in the entire election.

3.04 Districts shall pay the expenses for all annual or special elections from the school operating fund.

**Arkansas Department of Education
Proposed Rules Governing The Processes To Ensure The
Quality, Security, Validation, And Timeliness of Public School Data In
The Arkansas Public School Computer Network**

1.00 Regulatory Authority

These rules are promulgated pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-11-105, 6-11-128 and Act 723 of the 86th Arkansas General Assembly.

2.00 Purpose

These rules shall be applied to all school districts, open enrollment charter schools, and education service cooperatives for the purposes of ensuring the quality, security, validation, and timeliness of data in the Arkansas Public School Computer Network.

3.00 Definitions

For purposes of these rules, the following terms shall be defined to mean:

- 3.01 Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN) – the Department of Education’s computer network system for public school district, open enrollment charter school and education service cooperative reporting of financial management data and student management data to the Department of Education.
- 3.02 Financial Management Systems Applications – Computer software used primarily to process and record financial transactions. The SunGard Pentamotion financial management systems applications provided by APSCN include the following integrated modules: Fund Accounting, Human Resources, Fixed Assets, Budget Preparation, Personnel Budgeting, Purchasing and Warehouse.
- 3.03 Student Management Systems Applications – Computer software used primarily to process and maintain student records. The SunGard Pentamotion student management systems applications provided by APSCN include: Demographics, Attendance, Scheduling, Report Cards, Discipline and Medical.
- 3.04 Data Quality Metrics – Specified data that have a high degree of relevance to the measurement of performance and that are scored based on accuracy indicators. They are used for the purpose of measuring and tracking the quality of the data.

4.00 Required of the Arkansas Public School Computer Network

- 4.01 All school districts, open enrollment charter schools, and educational cooperatives shall, at a minimum, use the following financial management systems applications of the Arkansas Public School Computer Network:
 - 4.01.1 Fund Accounting (including all activity funds)
 - 4.01.2 Budget Preparation
 - 4.01.3 Human Resources
 - 4.01.4 Fixed Assets
- 4.02 After approval by the Department of Education, a school district, open enrollment charter school or educational cooperative may use a different software system if:
 - 4.02.1 The Department determines that the proposed software meets the minimum reporting requirements provided by the network;
 - 4.02.2 The software selected enables the school district, open enrollment charter school or educational cooperative to provide all district transaction information to the Department in a compatible format and in sufficient detail as required by the Department; and
 - 4.02.3 The Department approves the use of the software system.

5.00 Data Quality and Security

- 5.01 The Department shall implement the use of policies, procedures, and personnel to provide for data quality and security of all data transmitted over APSCN. The Department shall:
 - 5.01.1 Periodically conduct a thorough security review and security risk assessment for all information, including without limitation personally identifiable employee and student information that originates in the school districts, open enrollment charter schools and educational cooperatives and terminates on Department of Information Systems and APSCN servers.
 - 5.01.2 Create security policies and procedures.
 - 5.01.3 Monitor the mechanism for the network's end-to-end, enterprise-wide financial and student information systems.

- 5.01.4 Create and maintain a process for documenting and monitoring the quality of data from its source of entry into the network to any educational data repository in the Department.
- 5.01.5 Establish standards and monitor compliance with standards for all software and data testing in the network.
- 5.02 By June 30, 2008, the Department shall develop a certification program for each school district, open enrollment charter school and educational cooperative to have a least one (1) Certified APSCN Financial User and Trainer certified in the following financial application areas: Systems Administration, Fund Accounting, Human Resources, Fixed Assets, Budget Preparation, Personnel Budgeting, Purchasing, Warehouse, Cognos Reporting, SIS (Statewide Information System). The certification program will include the following components:
 - 5.02.1 Courses in the application areas.
 - 5.02.2 Training in using the network's reporting tools.
 - 5.02.3 An examination developed and/or approved by the Department that tests the applicant's knowledge and skills in all the application areas and reporting tools.
 - 5.02.4 A three-year plan developed by each school district, open enrollment charter school, and educational cooperative that specifies the name of each person who is to receive certification in each application area. This plan must be originally submitted to the Department by September 30, 2008, and updated by September 30 of each subsequent year.
 - 5.02.5 Each applicant for certification will have a maximum of three (3) years to obtain certification.
 - 5.02.6 In a school district of five hundred (500) or fewer students, one (1) person may be certified in both financial and student management.
- 5.03 By June 30, 2008, the Department shall develop a certification program for each school district, open enrollment charter school and educational cooperative to have a least one (1) Certified APSCN Student Management User and Trainer certified in the following student management application areas: Systems Administration, Demographics, Attendance, Scheduling, Report Cards, Discipline, Medical, Cognos Reporting, SIS

(Statewide Information System). The certification program will include the following components:

5.03.1 Courses in the application areas.

5.03.2 Training in using the network's reporting tools.

5.03.3 An examination developed and /or approved by the Department that tests the applicant's knowledge and skills in the application areas.

5.03.4 A three-year plan developed by each school district, open enrollment charter school and educational cooperative that specifies the name of each person who is to receive certification in each application area. This plan must be originally submitted to the Department by September 30, 2008, and updated by September 30 of each subsequent year.

5.03.5 Each applicant for certification will have a maximum of three (3) years to obtain certification.

5.03.6 In a school district of five hundred (500) or fewer students, one (1) person may be certified in both financial and student management.

5.04 Data Quality Metrics Program - The Department shall develop a data quality metrics program designed to significantly reduce the number of data errors within the network's applications and data warehouse and provide reports on code changes and time availability of information, including:

5.04.1 The number of code changes made by school districts, open enrollment charter schools and educational cooperatives in mid-year.

5.04.2 The percent of prime time availability of all applications that feed data into the network and data warehouse.

5.04.3 The percent of time availability of each school district, open enrollment charter school and educational cooperative server and local area network for use with the network's availability.

5.04.4 Corrective actions taken on the network's applications and data warehouse.

5.04.5 Preventive actions taken to avoid downtime and data errors.

5.04.6 Cycle data tardiness.

5.04.7 Number of data corrections made during each cycle submission.

**PROPOSED RULES GOVERNING THE REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES FOR
RENEWING A STANDARD ARKANSAS TEACHING LICENSE
DRAFT FOR JULY 9, 2007**

1.00 PURPOSE

- 1.01** The purpose of these rules is to establish the requirements and procedures for renewing a standard Arkansas teaching license.

2.00 REGULATORY AUTHORITY

- 2.01** These rules are promulgated pursuant to the authority of the State Board of Education under Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-11-105, 6-17-402 (Rep.1999), 25-15-201 et seq. and Acts 169 and 628 of 2007. (Supp.1999), and Ark. Code Ann. 6-17-402

3.00 DEFINITIONS- For purposes of these rules the following terms shall be defined as follows:

- 3.01 Automatic Renewal-** The process of renewing the standard teaching license for those teachers employed in a public school setting, who were teaching the school year prior to the expiration of their teaching license, and who have cleared at least one background check with Arkansas State Police and FBI, and who have met the requirements for professional development.
- 3.02 College Level Coursework-** Coursework taken from a regionally or nationally accredited college/university that is in the area of licensure (OR) professional education coursework at the current level of licensure (OR) educational technology/computer courses (OR) a combination of the above mentioned (OR) coursework taken to add additional areas to a current teaching license.
- 3.03 Educational Setting-** The employment setting where one is working as a teacher, librarian, counselor, administrator, educational consultant, or substitute teacher. This may be a public or private school, college/ university, educational co-op, Department of Education, adult education setting, or other agency or organization that employs licensed teachers in an educational setting.
- 3.04 Grace Period-** That period of time immediately following the expiration of a standard teaching license, not to exceed one calendar year, to meet general renewal requirements without additional penalties or assessments.
- 3.05 Immediate Previous Year -** The spring and fall semester of the current calendar year, (OR) the spring semester of the current calendar year and the prior fall semester.
- 3.06 Teacher-** An individual who holds a standard Arkansas teaching license (including expired and current), inclusive of educational administration, standard teaching areas, approvals, non-instructional student services, adult education, added endorsements and professional and technical licensure areas.

*Revised proposal for State Board of Education
July 9, 2007*

3.07 Teaching Experience- That time period of experience gained while working in an educational setting as a teacher, librarian, counselor, administrator, educational consultant, or substitute teacher.

3.08 Professional Development - A coordinated set of planned, learning activities for teachers that are standards based and that meet the required Focus Areas for Professional Development and the Approved Professional Development Activities requirements as identified in the Arkansas Department of Education Rules Governing ACTAAP and the Academic Distressed Program (June 14, 2004). Professional Development (July 2005).

3.09 Year of Teaching Experience - A year of teaching experience shall be a minimum of 120 days per school year or calendar year while employed in an educational setting.

3.10 Retired Teacher- A teacher who has retired and is actively drawing benefits from the Teacher Retirement System.

4.00 GENERAL RENEWAL REQUIREMENTS FOR A STANDARD ARKANSAS TEACHING LICENSE AND FOR A LICENSE THAT HAS BEEN EXPIRED LESS THAN ONE YEAR AND FOR RETIRED TEACHERS.

4.01 Teachers holding a current, standard Arkansas teaching license may renew that license ~~provided they~~ upon meeting the following general renewal requirements.

4.01.1 Teachers not teaching in a public school setting or teachers that have not met requirements for the automatic renewal of their teaching license shall submit an application for the renewal of their teaching license to the Office of Professional Licensure.

4.01.2 At the time of application, the teacher shall provide verification of the following requirements.

4.01.2.1 Two years of teaching experience during the previous five (5) years.
(OR)

4.01.2.2 One year of teaching experience for the immediate previous year
(OR)

4.01.2.3 Successful completion of six hours of college level coursework within the previous five (5) years.

4.01.3 A teacher may add partial years of experience over the previous five years to document the two years of teaching experience necessary to renew their teaching license.

4.01.4 Teachers shall provide verification of sixty (60) clock hours of professional development annually, beginning with the ~~2004-2005~~ 2005-2006 school year.

4.01.4.1 Teachers retiring prior to or after July 31, 2007, while holding a valid Arkansas teaching license, shall have professional development waived when:

4.01.4.1.1 The teacher has provided written documentation of having retired from teaching. This documentation shall be provided by the Arkansas Teacher Retirement System.

4.01.4.1.2 A teaching license that was valid at time of retirement has been expired less than one (1) year.

4.01.4.2 A teacher who retires while holding a valid teaching license, and returns to a licensed employment position with the public school district shall complete within the school year of the return to employment, the professional development required for the year in which the teacher returns and for each year thereafter while employed in the licensed position.

4.01.5 The teacher shall have successfully cleared all background checks as required by law.

4.01.5.1 Teachers who have successfully cleared the State Police and FBI background checks for licensure, shall not be subject to another background check for the renewal of their teaching license.

~~**4.02** For those teachers who do not meet the general renewal requirements, a one year non-renewable provisional teaching license shall be available upon meeting the following requirements:~~

~~4.02.1 The teacher shall hold an expired standard Arkansas teaching license.~~

~~4.02.2 The teacher shall submit a completed application for the provisional teaching license to the Office of Professional Licensure.~~

~~4.02.3 The teacher shall have successfully cleared all background checks as required by law.~~

~~4.02.4 The teacher shall verify employment in an educational setting in Arkansas.~~

4.02 A one year, non-renewable provisional teaching license shall be issued to teachers that have not met general renewal requirements and to teachers whose license has been expired for less than one year, upon meeting the following requirements.

4.02.1 Submission of a completed licensure application form requesting the provisional license.

4.02.2 Teachers who have not successfully cleared the required State Police and FBI background checks shall do so.

4.02.2.1 Teachers who have successfully cleared the required State Police and FBI background checks for licensure, shall not be subject to another background check.

4.02.3 The teacher shall verify employment on the Verification of Eligibility for Provisional Licensure form.

~~4.03 Teachers not meeting general renewal requirements shall meet the following requirements when renewing a license that has been expired for less than one year.~~

~~4.03.1 Six (6) hours of college level coursework when experience cannot be verified for two (2) of the previous five (5) years or for the immediate previous year prior to expiration of a license.~~

~~4.03.2 Sixty (60) clock hours of professional development~~

~~4.03.3 Teachers employed under a one year, non-renewable provisional license shall submit a completed application requesting the provisional license be converted to a standard teaching license.~~

4.03 The one year, non-renewable provisional teaching license, shall be converted to the five year standard teaching license upon meeting the following requirements

4.03.1 Submission of a licensure application form requesting the provisional teaching license be converted to the standard teaching license.

4.03.2 Document the completion of six (6) hours of college level coursework during the previous five years.

AND/OR

4.03.3 Written verification of completion of sixty (60) hours of professional development that was completed within one year of applying for the renewal of the teaching license, or within the year of provisional licensure if a provisional license was issued for employment.

5.00 REQUIREMENTS FOR THE RENEWAL OF A STANDARD TEACHING LICENSE THAT HAS BEEN EXPIRED FOR ONE (1) YEAR OR LONGER.

5.01 Teachers holding a standard teaching license that has been expired for one (1) year or longer, shall have their license renewed provided they meet the following renewal requirements:

*Revised proposal for State Board of Education
July 9, 2007*

5.01.1 The teacher shall submit a completed application for the renewal of the teaching license to the Office of Professional Licensure.

5.01.2 ~~The teacher shall have successfully cleared all background checks as required by law.~~

Teachers shall successfully clear at least one State Police and FBI background check for their teaching license.

5.01.2.1 Teachers who have successfully cleared the required State Police and FBI background checks for licensure shall not be subject to another background check for the renewal of their teaching license.

5.01.3 Teachers who have successfully completed a specialty area assessment in at least one licensure/endorsement area shall complete the following requirements:

5.01.3.1 Successfully complete the current state required specialty area assessment in at least one licensure/endorsement area.

5.01.3.1.1 Teachers who have successfully completed the current Praxis II Specialty Area assessment for a licensure/endorsement area shall not be allowed to retake that assessment to meet renewal requirements.

OR

5.01.3.1.2 Successfully complete six hours of college level coursework from a nationally/regionally accredited college or university.

5.01.4 Teachers who have never successfully completed a specialty area assessment in at least one licensure/endorsement area shall successfully complete the current, state required specialty area assessment in at least one of their licensure/endorsement areas and successfully complete the current state required pedagogy assessment at their level of licensure. When the teacher holds licensure at different levels, they may complete the pedagogy assessment at the level of their choice.

5.01.5 Teachers whose license expired after 2005, shall provide verification of sixty (60) clock hours of professional development completed within one year of application for renewal or within the year of provisional licensure if a provisional license is issued for employment.

5.01.5.1 A teacher that was holding a valid Arkansas teaching license prior to or after July 31, 2007, at the time of retirement, but whose license has been expired longer than one (1) year, shall also meet requirements of 5.01.5.

5.01.6 A one year, non-renewable provisional teaching license shall be available for teachers not meeting general renewal requirements, and whose standard Arkansas license has been expired for one year or longer upon meeting the following requirements.

~~**5.01.6.1** The teacher shall hold an expired, standard Arkansas teaching license.~~

5.01.6.1 The teacher shall submit a completed application for the provisional teaching license to the Office of Professional Licensure.

5.01.6.2 The teacher shall have successfully cleared the State Police and FBI all background checks as required by law.

5.01.6.2.1 Teachers who have successfully cleared the required State Police and FBI background checks for licensure, shall not be subject to another background check.

5.01.6.3 The teacher shall verify employment ~~in an educational setting in Arkansas~~ on the Eligibility for Provisional Licensure form.

5.02 The one year, non-renewable provisional teaching license shall be converted to the standard five year teaching license, upon meeting the following requirements:

5.02.1 For teachers who have successfully completed a specialty area assessment in at least one licensure/endorsement area:

5.02.1.1 Submission of a licensure application form requesting the conversion of the provisional teaching license.

AND

5.02.1.2 Verification of having successfully completed the required specialty area assessment,

OR

5.02.1.3 Verification of having successfully completed the six (6) hours of college level coursework,

AND

*Revised proposal for State Board of Education
July 9, 2007*

5.02.1.4 Verification of having completed sixty (60) hours of professional development within one year of application for renewal or within the year of provisional licensure if a provisional license is issued for employment.

5.02.2 For teachers who have not completed a specialty area assessment in at least one licensure/endorsement area:

5.02.2.1 Verification of having successfully completed the required specialty area assessment.

AND

5.02.2.2 Verification of having successfully completed the required pedagogy assessment at their level of licensure.

AND

5.02.2.3 Verification of having completed sixty (60) hours of professional development within one year of application for renewal or within the year of provisional licensure if a provisional license is issued for employment.

6.00 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR RENEWAL OF A QUALIFIED CANDIDATE'S STANDARD ARKANSAS TEACHING LICENSE

6.01 The Arkansas standard teaching license shall be renewed for a period of five years.

6.02 The effective date of a renewed teaching license shall be January 1 of the year following the expiration date of the license. See section 6.11

6.03 The effective date of a renewed teaching license that has been expired longer than one year shall be January 1 of the year renewed.

6.04 A one year non-renewable provisional teaching license shall be available for teachers that have not met general renewal requirements, ~~and~~ hold an expired teaching license, and are employed in a position by schools, and other agencies and organizations that require a current teacher license. Teachers shall have successfully cleared all background checks as required by law.

6.04.1 The one-year provisional teaching license shall be available to those individuals employed as Teachers, Pathwise Mentors, Pathwise Monitors, Praxis III Assessors, Praxis III Assessor Trainers, Test Investigators,

Scholastic Audit consultants, and others as defined by the Arkansas
Department of Education.

- 6.05** The effective date of a one-year, non-renewable, provisional teaching license shall be the hire date as documented by the employer.
- 6.06** The expiration date of a one-year, non-renewable, provisional teaching license shall be one year from the hire date.
- 6.07** The expiration date of a renewed standard teaching license shall be December 31st of the fifth year.
- 6.08** Individuals not teaching in a public school setting or individuals that have not met requirements for the automatic renewal of their teaching license shall submit an application for the renewal of their teaching license to the Office of Professional Licensure.
- 6.09** Teachers applying for the renewal of their teaching license shall have successfully cleared all background checks as required by law.
- 6.10** There shall be a grace period immediately following the expiration of a standard teaching license, not to exceed one calendar year, to meet general renewal requirements without additional penalties or assessments.
- 6.11** Applications for the renewal of a standard Arkansas teaching license may be submitted to the Office of Professional Licensure as early as January 1 of the year of expiration.
- 6.12** Coursework used for the renewal of a standard teaching license shall be college level and from a regionally/nationally accredited college/university. The coursework shall be in the licensure area(s) held by the teacher (OR) professional education courses at the level of licensure held by the teacher (OR) basic computer/education technology courses (OR) coursework taken to add additional areas to a standard teaching license.
- 6.13** Documentation of experience for renewal purposes shall be provided by a public school superintendent, director of human resources, or director of other agency/organization employing licensed teachers.
- 6.14** Documentation of the required professional development for the renewal of a teaching license shall be provided by a public school superintendent, human resources director, or director of other agency/ organization employing licensed teachers.
- 6.15** Teachers that did not meet renewal requirements that were established under Annotated Code § 6-17-601 and 6-17-602 shall meet the renewal requirements that will be required of all teachers and shall be eligible for a one-year provisional teaching license.

*Revised proposal for State Board of Education
July 9, 2007*

- 6.16** The Office of Professional Licensure, as authorized by the State Board of Education, reserves the right to amend and/or rescind any Arkansas teaching license that has been issued in error.
- 6.17** Teachers shall not lose areas or levels of licensure at renewal as a result of transitioning to the new areas and levels of licensure.
- 6.18** Professional development required for the renewal of a standard teaching license shall not be in addition to professional development required to meet standards for accreditation.
- 6.19** Teachers shall be able to add partial years of experience during the previous five years to meet the general renewal requirements.
- 6.20** Professional development shall be required for the renewal of a standard teaching license.

Arkansas Department of Education
Rules Governing Arkansas Alternative Pay Programs
Proposed August 2007

1.0 Regulatory Authority

- 1.01 These rules shall be known as the Department of Education (Department) Rules Governing Arkansas Alternative Pay Program
- 1.02 These rules are enacted under the State Board of Education's (State Board) authority pursuant to Act 847 of 2007.

2.0 Purpose

- 2.01 The purpose of these rules is allow an Alternative Pay Programs to be created for both Licensed and Classified employees in Arkansas's public schools.

3.0 Definitions

For the purposes of these rules, the following terms shall mean:

- 3.01 "Alternative Pay" means a salary amount that is part of the licensed or classified employee's total compensation for additional responsibilities, mastery of new knowledge and skills, advanced career opportunities, increased student achievement, attracting highly qualified teachers or professional development exceeding state minimums.
- 3.02 "Classified Employee" means a persons employed by a public school district under a written annual contract who is not required to hold a teaching license issued by the Arkansas Department of Education as a condition of employment.
- 3.03 "Compensation" is the teacher's/employee's salary, excluding benefits.
- 3.04 "Licensed Employee" means a persons employed by a public school district who is required to hold a teaching license issued by the Arkansas Department of Education.
- 3.05 "Teacher" means any person who: 1) is required to hold a teaching license from the Arkansas Department of Education **unless the State Board has waived this requirement as part of a public charter school contract** and 2) is engaged directly in instruction with students in a classroom setting for more than seventy percent (70%) of the individual's contracted time, including a guidance counselor or school librarian.

4.0 Selection Process and Requirements for the Arkansas Alternative Pay Program

- 4.01 Public School Districts desiring to participate in the Arkansas Alternative Pay Program must submit an application to the State Board of Education.

Proposed for the August 13, 2007
Meeting of the State Board of Education

- 4.02 The program maybe for licensed employees, classified employees or both employee groups and all eligible employees may participate in the program.
- 4.03 A program may be implemented on a district-wide or on a school-by-school basis.
- 4.04 Alternative Plan Committee and Collaborative efforts are required for consideration
 - 4.04.1 Evidence of Collaborative efforts among the participating school board, administrators, teachers, classified employees, association representatives and parents of children attending the school district.
 - 4.04.2 A committee shall be established from the groups in 4.04.1 with fifty percent (50%) of the committee being composed of teachers.
 - 4.04.3 The committee members shall be selected by the respective groups which they represent.
 - 4.04.4 The program is a personnel policy and shall be promulgated in accordance with § 6-17-201, et. Seq. and § 6-17-2301, et. seq. except to the extent that those personnel policies are negotiated in any school district that recognizes an organization representing a majority of teachers.
 - 4.04.5 Show of interest resolution which states at least seventy percent (70%) of the employees are interested. (Another percentage may be established with approval by a majority vote of the teachers and the local school board.)
 - 4.04.6 The role of the committee shall be charged with the design, implementation and evaluation of the program.
- 4.05 Objective Criteria which shall be considered in all plans are:
 - 4.05.1 Measurable Indicators of student achievement
 - 4.05.2 Percent of alternative pay which is related to the annual increases in student test scores. (No more than fifty percent (50%) is **allowed to be based on an individual teacher's students' test scores.**)
 - 4.05.3 There is a clear system of payment which is not arbitrary.
 - 4.05.4 **The alternative pay shall be at least ten percent (10%) of the salary and payable in one year based upon one-contract year.**
 - 4.05.5 There is an established and ongoing support system for the participants with both financial and administrative resources to implement the program
 - 4.05.6 The program is aligned to the school's/district's Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. (ASCIP)
 - 4.05.7 The plan is a part of a larger set of reforms
 - 4.05.8 At least fifty –one percent (51%) of each employee group listed in 4.04.1 must elect to participate to implement any plan **for that employee group.** This is with the understanding that individual employees have the right to choose not to participate **in the plan for that group.**

5.00 Arkansas Alternative Pay Programs Timeline and Schedules

5.01 Quarterly written updates are to be provided to ADE on the implementation of an alternative pay plan yearly. Those reports are due on the following dates:

- a. October 1st
- b. January 1st
- c. April 1st
- d. July 1st

5.05 Arkansas Alternative Pay Programs should be ready for implementation by July 1st of the initial school year

5.06 These dates shall be subject to modification or alteration as determined in the best interest of the Arkansas Alternative Pay Programs program by the ADE.

5.0 Funding for the Arkansas Alternative Pay Programs

5.01 Funding will be from existing school and/or district revenue. No additional state funds have been appropriated at this time.

Arkansas Department of Education
Rules Governing the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program
Proposed August 2007

1.0 Regulatory Authority

- 1.01 These rules shall be known as the Department of Education (Department) Rules Governing the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program (REAP).
- 1.02 These rules are enacted under the State Board of Education's (State Board) authority pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-11-105, 25-15-201 et seq. and Act 1029 of 2007.

2.0 Purpose

- 2.01 The purpose of these rules is to create a pilot program to afford public school districts and public charter schools the opportunity to develop teacher compensation plans tailored to the needs of public school districts and/or public charter schools.

3.0 Definitions

For the purposes of these rules, the following terms shall mean:

- 3.01 "Compensation" which will be funded under the REAP plan will be the teacher's/employee's salary, excluding benefits.
- 3.02 "Knowledge and Skills" is the base portion of the teacher's compensation under a REAP compensation plan which considers but is not limited to factors such as years of experience and degree levels as set forth in the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Plan.
- 3.03 "Local Board" is the local school board of directors exercising the control and management of a public charter school or public school district.
- 3.04 "Performance" is the portion of the teacher's compensation under a REAP plan which considers, without limitation, factors such as: professional development, teacher attendance, student achievement both by class and school-wide, and the teacher's performance evaluations.
- 3.05 "Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program (REAP)" is an alternative plan for teacher compensation which may be developed by a public school, public school district, or public charter school.
- 3.06 "Participants" are the public school or school districts or public charter schools selected for participation in the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program.

- 3.07 “Peer Evaluations” means objective evaluations of teachers conducted by other teachers using multiple criteria including provisions for integrated on-going site-based professional development activities to improve instructional skills and learning that are aligned with student needs under §6-15-2009. These peer evaluators shall understand teaching and learning and be locally selected and periodically trained evaluators.
- 3.08 “Staff” are the teachers, administrators and/or classified employees who have voted to be participants in the REAP program.

4.0 Selection Criteria and Requirements in Considering the Application for Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program

- 4.01 Public school districts or public charter schools desiring to participate in the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program must submit an application to the State Board of Education, on forms developed by the Department. A district may apply on behalf of a single school within the public school district that desires to participate in the REAP plan.
- 4.02 Participants shall be selected through a competitive process.
- 4.02.1 Consideration will be given to qualified applicants from various locations and from districts of various sizes and demographics.
- 4.03 The application procedure shall provide for a phase-in process, beginning with a planning phase for a minimum period of twelve-months, to allow applicants access to resources that would allow sufficient research of best practices and time to garner community and staff support in submitting a REAP plan.
- 4.04 To participate in REAP, a participant must submit a proper application providing all necessary information and documents as requested by these rules and the form herein attached and incorporated as the REAP Application Form.
- 4.05 The REAP Application shall be submitted or postmarked to Human Resource Office of the ADE on or before 4:30 p.m. on Monday, March 3, 2008
- 4.06 To the extent practicable, the ADE shall select three REAP participants from each congressional district with at least one participant having a student population of less than 1,000 students; between 1,000 and 8,000 students; and greater than 8,000 students. In addition, the ADE shall, to the extent possible, strive to have REAP participants from each congressional district with at least one participant from each who has a percentage of eligible Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) student population greater than 90% students; less than 90% but greater than 70% eligible FRL students; and less than 70% FRL eligible students. To the extent possible, the ADE shall try to mix the student population requirements with differing demographics of percentage of eligible FRL students between Congressional districts so as to have a varied representation of size and demographic of students in the pilot study.

- 4.06.1 Each participant that meets the criteria mentioned in Section 4.06 shall receive point(s) pursuant to the rubric, which will be developed by the committee (Section 5.02), for each criteria met. In addition, each participant application shall receive point(s) on a competitive scale based on the quality of compliance with the requirements of Sections 4.00, 5.01 and 6.00 of these rules.
- 4.06.2 The ADE has the discretion to select certain REAP participants as necessary to comply with the selection criteria of Section 4.06 regardless of the competitive score of any single participant.
- 4.07 To participate in REAP, a participant must have an approved comprehensive school improvement plan, as defined in Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-15-419(9).
- 4.07.1 Prior to full implementation of a REAP plan, the comprehensive school improvement plan of the participant shall include:
- 4.07.1.1 Assessment and evaluation tools to measure student performance and progress based on an achievement gains model;
 - 4.07.1.2 Performance goals and benchmark improvement;
 - 4.07.1.3 Measures of student attendance and completion rates;
 - 4.07.1.4 A rigorous professional development system consistent with the comprehensive school improvement plan defined in Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-15-419(9) and student academic improvement plans as defined in Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-15-419(2);
 - 4.07.1.5 Measures of student, family, and community involvement and satisfaction;
 - 4.07.1.6 A data reporting system about students and their academic progress that provides parents and the public with understandable information.
 - 4.07.1.7 A teacher induction and mentoring program for probationary teachers that provides continuous learning and sustained teacher support; and
 - 4.07.1.8 Substantial participation by teachers in developing the REAP plan.
- 4.08 As part of the application process, schools wishing to participate shall conduct a vote of the teachers with the level for acceptance being seventy percent (70%) or another percent established by a majority vote of the teachers and approved by the local board.
- 4.08.1 A teacher in a school selected by the State Board of Education to participate may elect not to participate in the REAP plan.
- 4.08.2 If fifty-one percent (51%) or more of a participant school's teachers elect not to participate, the REAP plan shall not be implemented.
- 4.09 All recipients of funds provided by the REAP plan shall cooperate and share all school demographic and student achievement data with any state-sponsored evaluation of this program.

- 4.09.1 Applicant public school districts or public charter schools shall form a committee to consist of its administrators and teachers, the majority of whom shall be classroom teachers.
- 4.09.1.1 The classroom teacher members of the committee shall be elected by a majority of the classroom teachers voting by secret ballot.
- 4.09.1.2 The election shall be solely and exclusively conducted by classroom teachers, including the distribution of ballots to all classroom teachers.
- 4.09.2 The committee shall be responsible for creating, **assisting in the implementation** and evaluating the school's REAP plan.
- 4.09.3 The committee shall **annually** report to its local board on the evaluation of the school's REAP plan.
- 4.10 The contents of a REAP plan approved for participation in the REAP shall:
- 4.10.1 Describe how teachers can achieve career advancement and additional compensation;
- 4.10.2 Describe how participants will provide teachers with career advancement options that allow teachers to retain primary roles in student instruction and facilitate site-focused professional development that will help other teachers improve their skills.
- 4.10.3 Describe all assurances as to how the plan will prevent the **initial** compensation of participating staff members from being reduced by implementing the pay system developed as a result of the REAP plan.
- 4.10.4 Describe how the forty percent to sixty percent (40% - 60%) performance portion of compensation will be determined
- 4.10.5 Describe how the forty percent to sixty percent (40% - 60%) knowledge and skill base portion of compensation will be determined;
- 4.10.6 Describe how the plan will reform the "steps and lanes" salary schedule;
- 4.10.7 Describe how the participants will encourage a collaborative relationship among teachers; and
- 4.10.8 Describe how, after full plan implementation, the alternative compensation system will be sustained **if it is deemed successful** or phased out if the REAP plan evaluation reveals that the plan does not work for the participant.
- 4.11 Rewarding Excellence in Achievement plans approved for participation in the program may include provisions regarding the compensation for administrators and other staff members.
- 4.12 Under the REAP plan, increases in compensation for the performance portion, forty percent to sixty percent (40% - 60%) of the teacher's total compensation, shall include:
- 4.12.1 Achievement gains of students in each teacher's class on student scores under the statewide assessment program described in Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-15-433. Locally selected and Department of Education approved standardized assessment outcomes for students in each teacher's class may also be included.

- 4.12.2 Achievement gains of students on a school-wide basis under the statewide assessment program described in Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-15-433. Locally selected and Department of Education – approved standardized assessment outcomes may also be included; and
- 4.12.3 The remaining percentage of the performance portion of compensation of the teacher’s total compensation shall be based on an objective teacher evaluation program that includes:
- 4.12.3.1 An individual objective teacher evaluation conducted by the school principal that is aligned with the comprehensive school improvement plan and professional development plan described in Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-15-2607; and
- 4.12.3.2 Peer objective evaluations using multiple criteria conducted by locally selected and periodically trained evaluators who understand teaching and learning and that include provisions for integrated ongoing site-based professional development activities to improve instructional skills and learning that are aligned with student needs under Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-15-2009.

5.00 REAP Timeline and Schedule

- 5.01 All applications due or postmarked on or before 4:30 p.m., [Monday, March 3, 2008](#).
- 5.02 ADE shall convene the appropriate committees [to develop a rubric for the application process as well as](#) to read and evaluate REAP applications.
- 5.03 ADE shall announce the twelve (12) approved REAP applications or that number up to twelve (12).
- 5.04 [May 1, 2008 through May 1, 2009](#): Participants are required to implement the “phase-in” process for all approved applicants. Quarterly written updates are to be provided to ADE on the implementation phasing-in processing with updates due:
- a. [August 1, 2008](#)
- b. [November 1, 2008](#)
- c. [February 1, 2008](#)
- d. [May 1, 2008](#)
- 5.04.1 Districts may count any time already used to phase-in an already existing REAP program or similar program approved as a REAP application for the phase-in process time period required in Section 5.00 of these rules.
- 5.05 July 1, 2009 is the latest required date for implementation for an approved REAP program.
- 5.06 These dates shall be subject to modification or alteration as determined in the best interest of the REAP program by the ADE.

6.00 Staff Development

6.01 Staff development activities for a participant in the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program shall:

- 6.01.1 Focus on the school classroom and research-based strategies that improve student learning;
- 6.01.2 Provide opportunities for teachers to practice and improve their instructional skills over time;
- 6.01.3 Provide opportunities for teachers to use student data as part of their daily work to increase student achievement;
- 6.01.4 Enhance teacher content knowledge and instructional skills;
- 6.01.5 Align with state academic standards;
- 6.01.6 Provide opportunities to build professional relationships, foster collaboration among principals and staff who provide instruction and provide opportunities for teacher-to-teacher mentoring; and
- 6.01.7 Align with the REAP plan of the participant.

6.02 Staff development activities for participants in the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program may include:

- 6.02.1 Curriculum development and curriculum training programs; and
- 6.01.2 Activities that provide teachers and other staff members training to enhance teacher, team, and school performance.

6.03 The participants may implement other staff development activities associated with professional teacher compensation models.

7.00 Evaluation of Participants

7.01 The Department of Education shall commission an annual evaluation of the REAP plan of each school participating in the program.

7.02 The annual evaluation shall include, without limitation, consideration of:

- 7.02.1 Student scores under the statewide assessment program described in § 6-15-433;
- 7.02.2 Student attendance;
- 7.02.3 Student grades;
- 7.02.4 Incidents involving student discipline;
- 7.02.5 Socioeconomic data on students' families;
- 7.02.6 Parental satisfaction with the schools;
- 7.02.7 Student satisfaction with the schools; and
- 7.02.8 Correlations between student assessment gains and teacher degree levels, years of experience, staff development, and a school's status for having a qualified teacher in every classroom under Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-15-1004.

8.0 Reporting and Continued Funding for the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program

- 8.01 In addition to the program evaluation required by Section 7.00 of these rules each participating school district or public charter school shall report on the implementation and effectiveness of its REAP plan and make recommendation by August 15th each year to its local board.
- 8.01.1 The local board shall transmit a copy of the report with a summary of the findings and recommendations of the public school **or school** district or public charter school to the Commissioner of Education.
- 8.02 If the Commissioner determines that a public school **or school** district or public charter school that receives funding under the REAP program is not complying with the requirements of the program, the Commissioner shall withhold further funding from that participant.
- 8.02.1 Such withheld funds may be reallocated to other existing REAP participants or **REAP applicants in an alternate status of award.**
- 8.02.2 Before making the determination to withhold funds, the Commissioner shall notify the participant of any deficiencies and provide the participant an opportunity to comply with the requirements of the REAP program.
- 8.03 At the end of the REAP period, the Commissioner shall present evaluation findings and recommendations to the State Board of Education, the House Education Committee and the Senate Education Committee.

Procedures for the REAP Application

1. Sections I, II, III and VI are to be completed on the application form. Sections IV and V may be completed by a Word document and attached to the application. (Applications may be submitted on-line.)
2. All responses to sections IV and V should be titled/ labeled for easy reference by the reviewers. Each section should define the goal and include specific measurable objectives for each goal.
3. The budget should differentiate the costs for planning and incentives to staff. The budget should also outline how any projected new revenue would be added to these incentives as well as how to address compensation of staff which may fluctuate due to varying results on the criteria for compensation.
4. The narrative for Section IV “Criteria for Selection” of the application should **not** exceed ten (10) typed pages, double spaced with a font minimum of twelve (12).
5. The deadline for the application is the end of business (4:30 p.m.) **March 3, 2008**. Applications postmarked **on or** prior to **March 3, 2008** will be accepted.

Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program
(REAP)

Application for the 2007-08 School Year

II. Name of School, Charter School, or District_____

School / District Address_____

City_____

Phone Number_____ Fax_____

III. Authorized Administrator_____

Title_____ Mobile Number_____

IV. School / District Demographic: (Please report data as reported in APSCN)

a) Name of Educational Service Cooperative_____

b) Congressional District_____

c) Student Population_____

d) Grade Levels_____

e) Percent of the Student Population eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) priced meals: 2005-06_____ and 2006-07_____

f) Percent of Student Attendance: 2005-06_____ and 2006-07_____

g) Percent of Students Graduating: 2005-06_____ and 2006-07_____

h) Average ACT score for: 2005-06_____ and 2006-07_____

i) Percent of Licensed Teachers who voted in support of REAP_____

j) Percent of Licensed Teachers who stated they would participate in REAP_____

k) Percent of Licensed Teachers with a Masters Degree_____

l) Percent of Licensed Teachers with a Doctorate Degree_____

- m) Percent of Teacher Attendance:
2005-06 and 2006-07
- n) Average number of Professional Development hours per teacher:
2005-06 and 2006-07
- o) Average Years of Experience of Licensed Staff:
2005-06 and 2006-07
- p) Percent of Highly Qualified Teachers in the Core Academic Content Areas:
2005-06 and 2006-07

IV. Criteria for Selection: (Please address these topics in an accompanying narrative.)

- a) Performance Goals of Students with the Implementation of this plan
- b) Describe the Selection and Responsibility of individuals' service on the REAP Committee for the School / District
- c) Describe the Rigor of the Professional Development Plan by the School / District to enhance student performance
- d) Describe how students, families and the community will be involved in the REAP program.
- e) Describe the Recruitment and Retention efforts of the school / district to hire and retain highly qualified teachers to enhance student learning.
- f) Describe the new Professional Pay Plan and methods for teacher compensation. (This plan must include but is not limited to the following criteria.):
 - i. Career Advancement Options
 - ii. How the 40% - 60% will be determined for Performance (Gains in student achievement on appropriate assessment instruments);
 - iii. How the 40% -60% will be determined for Knowledge and Skills;
 - iv. How the steps/lanes salary schedule has been reformed; and
 - v. How the plan will be eliminated or phased out if not successful.
- g) Describe the Evaluation of the Plan and how the evaluation will be reported to local School Board Members and the Community.
- h) Attach a copy of the district's approved comprehensive school improvement plan (ACSIP), as defined in Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-15-419(9).

V. Implementation:

A. Planning Period: _____

B. Describe the Phase In Process:

a. _____

b. _____

C. Budget: Outline the requested budget for planning and implementation. (This may be an attachment.)

VI. **Assurances:**

By signing below, I indicate that I understand and agree to abide by the requirements of the Program as set forth in the Arkansas Department of Education's Rules Governing the Rewarding Excellence in Achievement Program (REAP), a copy of which I have received, and I further understand that my failure to fully comply with the Program Rules could cause the Department to terminate both my individual and my school district's participation in the Program.

Signature Required:

Printed Name and Position of School / District Administrator

Signature of School / District Administrator Date

*The REAP Application must be postmarked or received by the Arkansas Department of Education on or prior to March 3, 2008, for consideration for the 2007-08 school year.

Send completed Application to: Ms. Beverly A. Williams, Assistant Commissioner, Arkansas Department of Education, 4 Capitol Mall, Room 204-B, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201.

<u>For Use by the Arkansas Department of Education only:</u>	
<u>Approved by:</u>	<u>Date Approved:</u>

REAP Timeline

1. **March 3, 2008:** Application Deadline to the ADE
2. **April 1, 2008:** Committee formed to read and evaluate the REAP applications
3. **April 30, 2008:** Announce the twelve (12) approved REAP Applications
4. **May 1, 2008 through May 1, 2009:** Required planning and phasing-in process of all approved applications. Quarterly updates due to the ADE on:
 - a. **August 1, 2008**
 - b. **November 1, 2008**
 - c. **February 1, 2009**
 - d. **May 1, 2009**
5. **July 1, 2009** Planned Implementation for all approved REAP programs.

Arkansas Department of Education
Rules Governing Incentives for Teacher Recruitment and Retention in High
Priority Districts with an Average Daily Membership of 1,000 or Fewer
~~July 2005~~ August 2007

1.00 Regulatory Authority

- 1.01 These rules shall be known as the Arkansas Department of Education Rules Governing Incentives for Teacher Recruitment and Retention in High Priority Districts.
- 1.02 These rules are enacted pursuant to the Arkansas State Board of Education's authority under Ark. Code Ann. §§ 6-11-105, 6-17-811, 25-25-201 et seq. and Act 1044 of 2007.

2.00 Purpose

The purpose of this rule is to establish the procedures to provide incentives for teacher recruitment and retention in high priority districts.

3.00 Definitions

Unless otherwise specifically stated herein, the term:

- ~~3.01 Bonus Pay Period – Means the three year period in which an eligible employee receives a signing or a retention bonus.~~
- 3.01 Department - Means the Arkansas Department of Education.
- 3.02 High Priority District - Means a public school district of ~~one thousand (1000) or fewer students~~ in which eighty percent (80%) or more of public school students are eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program under the National School Lunch Act based on the October 1 student count of the previous year submitted to the Department of Education and have had a three-quarter average daily membership in the previous year of one thousand (1,000) or fewer students. ~~for the 2003-2004 school year.~~
- 3.03 New Teacher Bonus – Means an incentive bonus provided under Sections 4.01.1 through 4.01.3 of these rules to a teacher that is within the first three (3) years of employment with a single high priority district.
- 3.04 Previous year - Means the school year immediately preceding the current school year.

- 3.05 ~~Retention Bonus - Means beginning in the 2004-2005 school year a one time \$2,000 bonus paid per year for three consecutive years to certified teachers employed by a high priority district during the school year, and who were employed at the high priority district during the previous school year and who have not received or are currently receiving a signing bonus, pursuant to these rules, from the school district. an incentive bonus of two-thousand dollars (\$2,000) to be paid to a teacher who has received a new teacher bonus and enters his or her fourth or subsequent year of service in the same or other high- priority school district or for a teacher employed in a high-priority district who does not meet the requirements of Sections 4.01.1 through 4.01.3 of these rules.~~

~~Signing Bonus— Means beginning in the 2004-2005 school year, a one time \$4,000 bonus awarded to a teacher not employed by a high priority district for the previous school year, who signs a new contract to teach in a high priority district for the current school year and who has not received a prior signing or retention bonus, pursuant to these rules, from the school district.~~

- 3.06 ~~Teacher - Means those certified personnel~~ a licensed classroom teacher who spends seventy percent (70%) of their his or her time working directly with students in a classroom setting teaching all grade-level or subject- matter appropriate classes, including guidance counselors and librarians.

4.00 Incentives

- 4.01 ~~Beginning in the 2004-2005 school year, a certified teacher~~ 2007-2008 school year, and each school year thereafter, a teacher licensed by the State Board of Education and teaching in a high-priority district shall receive incentive pay. who enters into a teaching contract and who completes the entire current school year teaching in a high-priority district shall, at the end of the school year and upon completion of his or her contracted teaching obligations, be entitled to receive, in addition to all other contracted salary and benefits:

4.01.1 A newly hired teacher who has not previously taught in a high-priority district, a one (1) time signing bonus of four thousand dollars (\$4,000) for the first year of service in the district to be paid upon completion of the full year of teaching.

4.01.2 A newly hired teacher who meets the requirements of Section 4.01.1 of these rules, who continues to teach in the

same high-priority district and who completes the second full year of contracted teaching obligations, a new teacher bonus in the amount of three thousand dollars (\$3,000).

4.01.3 A teacher who meets the requirements of Sections 4.01.1 and 4.01.2 of these rules, who continues to teach in the same high- priority district and who completes the third full year of contracted teaching obligations, a new teacher bonus in the amount of three thousand dollars (\$3,000).

4.0.1.4 A teacher who meets the requirements of Sections 4.01.1 through 4.01.3 of these rules, who enters the fourth or subsequent year of service with the same high-priority district or begins employment with a high-priority district other than the high-priority district where he or she was employed when he or she received any bonuses pursuant to Sections 4.01.1 through 4.01.3 above shall receive a retention bonus in the amount of two thousand dollars (\$2,000) for the fourth and each subsequent complete year of service in the high-priority district to be paid at the end of the school year after completing all contractual obligations

4.01.5 A teacher employed in a high priority district who does not meet the requirements of Sections 4.01.1 through 4.01.3 of these rules, shall receive a retention bonus in the amount of two thousand dollars (\$2,000) for each complete year of service in the high-priority district to be paid at the end of the school year after completing all contractual obligations.

4.02 The Superintendent of the high-priority district where the teacher is employed shall certify in writing to the Department that the teacher has completed all contractual obligations for the school year. The Superintendent shall submit such certification information for applicable teachers to the Department no more than twenty-one (21) calendar days after the end of the high-priority district's school year.

~~Beginning in the 2004-2005 school year teachers who sign their initial contract with a high priority district shall receive a one-time signing bonus of \$4,000 at the beginning of the school year.~~

4.02.1 ~~For each of the next two years, that teacher referred to in Section 4.02 shall receive a \$3,000 bonus at the beginning of the school year while still employed at the same high priority district.~~

- 4.03 No teacher is entitled to any incentives outlined in Section 4.01 above unless the teacher has fulfilled all contractual obligations for the current school year.
- ~~4.02.2 If the teacher has received bonus pay under Section 4.02 of this rule and voluntarily leaves the high priority district before the end of the three year bonus pay period, the teacher shall pay back the amount of the bonus received in the previous year.~~
- ~~4.02.3 If the teacher voluntarily leaves the high priority district during the school year, the teacher shall pay back the previous year's bonus and the current year's bonus.~~
- ~~4.02.4 If a teacher has received a signing new teacher bonus, and the teacher is reassigned involuntarily to a position that is not eligible for signing a new teacher bonus pay or that teacher is dismissed involuntarily by a high priority district, the teacher shall not be required to repay the applicable signing new teacher bonus.~~
- ~~4.02.5 If a teacher qualified to receive a signing new teacher bonus leaves the high priority district due to a serious medical emergency, the teacher shall not be required to repay the signing new teacher bonus provided documentation from a licensed physician validating the need to terminate employment due to medical reasons is filed with the district.~~
- 4.03 Beginning in 2004-2005 ~~2007-2008~~, all currently employed certified licensed teachers who have been employed by the high priority district in the previous school year and who are not receiving a signing a new teacher bonus, shall be eligible to receive a \$2,000 retention bonus at the beginning of each of the next two subsequent school years end of the school year for each subsequent school year as long as the teacher continues to be employed by the high priority district.
- ~~4.03.1 If a currently employed teacher receives a retention bonus under Section 4.03 of this rule and then voluntarily leaves the high priority district before the end of the bonus pay period, the teacher shall pay back the amount of the retention bonus received in the previous year.~~

~~4.03.2 If a teacher has received a retention bonus and that teacher is reassigned involuntarily to a position that is not eligible for retention bonus pay or a teacher is dismissed involuntarily by a high priority district, the teacher shall not be required to repay the applicable retention bonus pay.~~

~~4.03.3 If a teacher qualified to receive retention bonus pay leaves the high priority district due to a serious medical emergency, the teacher shall not be required to repay the retention bonus provided documentation from a licensed physician validating the need to terminate employment due to medical reasons is filed with the district.~~

~~4.04 No teacher may receive both a signing bonus and a retention bonus in the same year.~~

4.04 Any bonus pay awarded to an eligible, full time equivalent teacher who does not work the entire school year shall be pro-rated based on the portion of the school year that the eligible teacher was employed by the high- priority district.

5.0 Documentation

5.01 Beginning in ~~2004-2005~~ 2007-2008, the Department shall issue by September 1 of each year a list of the high priority districts in which eighty percent (80%) or more of the public school students are eligible for ~~free and reduced price meals~~ the free or reduced-price lunch program under the National School Lunch Act and that had a three-quarter average daily membership in the previous year of one thousand (1,000) or fewer students.

5.02 Beginning in ~~2004-2005~~ 2007-2008, the Free and Reduced Price Meal calculation shall be based on the list of eligible students in a district as verified by the Child Nutrition Unit of the Department based on the October 1 list of eligibles for grades K-12 for the previous school year.

5.03 The determination of eligibility for high priority district designation in annexed or consolidated districts is made based on the ~~combining~~ combination of the enrollment, average daily membership and free and reduced price meal calculations for the two or more districts that were annexed or consolidated.

5.04 Beginning in ~~2004-2005~~ 2007-2008, high priority districts shall notify the Department on forms provided by the Department, and identify all eligible teachers employed at the high priority district for

the current school year. The district shall list teachers who were not employed by the high priority district during the previous school year and teachers employed the previous school year who continue to be employed for the current school year.

- 5.05 Upon receipt of the form from each high priority district and the written certification from the Superintendent required by Section 4.02 of these rules, the Department shall distribute the funds to the districts who will distribute the appropriate bonuses to the teachers employed by the high priority districts.
- 5.06 Districts will be responsible for the payment of all matching benefit payments.

6.00 Sanctions Monitoring of Program

- 6.01 It shall be the responsibility of each the high- priority district to monitor the incentive bonus distribution in their district and provide data to the Arkansas Department of Education.
- 6.02 The Arkansas Department of Education's Teacher Recruitment and Retention Unit will collect the data and monitor the total program for the state.
- ~~6.02 If a teacher receiving either a signing new teacher bonus or a retention bonus voluntarily leaves the high priority district before the end of the three-year bonus pay period or if the teacher voluntarily leaves the high priority district during the school year, the district shall require the teacher to pay back the appropriate bonus amount.~~
- ~~6.03 Upon receipt of the bonus payback from the teacher, the district shall forward the payment(s) to the Finance Section at the Department.~~